AN

ANSWER

TO

Scripture Miſtaken.

UMI

AN
ANSWER
TO
Mr. *SPENCER'S* BOOK
Intituled
Scripture Miſtaken.

Whereunto is added
A Brief Survey of Antiquity, for the Trial of the Romiſh Doctrine aſſerted in the aforeſaid Book.

By *H. F.* D. D. one of his Majeſties Chaplains in Ordinary.

Οὐχ ὡς καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον—

LONDON,
Printed by *R. Norton*, for *Richard Royſton* at the *Angel* in *Ivie-Lane*, 1660.

THE PREFACE.

Being both provoked and invited to make some Answer to Mr. Spencer's *Book of* Scriptures Mistaken, *I assayed to do it as briefly as I could; and it was needful I should confine my self to the Order, he observed, and to the places of Scripture, he examined as urged by Protestants against the* Romish *Doctrine and Practise, and to those he alledges as witnessing for it.*

But seeing he boasts in his Preface, *that he will deal with the Protestants, and beat them at their own Weapon,* Scripture: *and so comes not to the trial of* Antiquity, *which he pretends, and with too much confidence presumes to be their own: therefore*

I shall add A Brief Survey of the Ancient Doctrine and Practise of the Catholick Church, as to the points here Controverted; that it may appear, how they are worsted there, what brags soever they make of Antiquity.

But it may be said, There are Books enough and too many: which do but continue the Controversie, and keep the breach open; More need there is to endeavour some closing, and to make offers of Agreement. True, if we could conceive any hope of condescention on their parts, or perceive any intent of Peace in them, whom we still finde lying at the catch, and laying hold upon all advantages, which may promote their cause with all sorts of people: into whose hands they thrust such Books, as may render it more plausible, and into whose ears they are continually whispering, what may represent the Protestant as guilty of Schism, and Heresie: thereby enforcing us to break silence, and to inform our People (if we will not have them seduced) of the cunning of our Adversaries, to discover their

Dawbings,

Dawbings, and vain Pretences, such as Mr. Spencer *and others sent over to the same purpose, do use for deceiving of the Unwary.*

Peace among Christians, surely is the most beseeming, the most desirable Thing in the world; and would be, considering how it now stands with the too much divided Catholick Church, the greatest blessing; and we have been sufficiently taught how to value it by the past and present distractions and differences amongst us. But when we talk of Peace to them of Rome, *they are ready to reproach us with* Physician heal thy self, *make up your own breaches and Divisions, before you speak of being received into the Unity of the Catholick Church. Let them alone a while with their so much pretended unity: our first care certainly is to make peace at home, and in the mean time (as we see it the care and prudence of all States to guard the Borders against the Forrein and Common Enemy) to fortifie those Doctrines wherein the Parties dissenting do agree, and are*

us within common bounds enclosed.

And blessed be God, we have a great expedient for the restoring of our Peace by the return of our gracious Soveraign unto us; who is the true Defender *of the Faith, the great* Example *of Constancy in Religion, and of Clemency in forgiving and forgetting injuries. And when we his Subjects, being assured of the Truth and Religion which he defends, have also learned to obey by His Example, and with mutual condescensions and endeavours of peace, to entertain and embrace one another: then shall our hearts be better prepared with a charitable compliance for the adversary abroad, when soever he shall think it convenient to admit thoughts of Peace, and shall seriously consider how we are all bound to profess and believe* One (*not* Roman, *but* Christian) Catholick Church.

We cannot but be sensible, what hand they that stile themselves Catholicks, *have had in kindling this fire among us, and bringing fuel to it: and we would have them (being so oft convinced and told*

told of it) sensible, how unchristian, uncatholick a part it is; how contrary to the Peace of the Church.

But could they that are sent over amongst us to blow the coals, forget their Instructions, and Vow of Obedience: and they that send them learn to value the Peace of Christendome: yet what hope (may some ask) could there be of an Accord in Doctrine? If we consider what passed in the Germain Colloquies, during the Time of the Trent Council, and observe what condescention and moderation appeared then, notwithstanding the intervention of so many Nuncio's from Rome, and the so much boasted pretence of Infallibility in that Church: If also we carefully look into their Controversie-Writers, and note what concessions they sometimes make in the point, what mincings of the Romish doctrine, when they are put to it: there may appear a possibility in the thing it self, if peaceable men had the handling of it. But when we consider on the other hand, how all these endeavours for Peace became Fruit-

less: and all the offers made at Trent by moderate Men in that Council were silenced and rejected; and notwithstanding all their mincings and concessions in those points, the Doctrine and Practise of that Church goes as high as ever: we may imagine there are some over-ruling points *of State-doctrine, (of the* Court *rather then* Church of Rome) *which command the Rest and forbid all condescention and moderation: such at least, as may give us any hope of a tolerable agreement.*

And thus it will be, what ever we endeavour, till order be taken with him, that pretends to the Infallibility and exorbitant Power: of whom we may say in this particular, as the Apostle doth of that lawless person, 2 Thess. 2. 7. He who now letteth, will let, until he be taken out of the way: *that is, until he be reduced within the bounds of the Canons of the Catholick Church. A glorious work for Christian Princes: a work of greatest concernment to the Peace of Christendome.*

But till that be done, I would com-

mend

mend these considerations following, to All that delight, or are inclined to be in the Communion of that Church, and in subjection to that pretended infallible and all-powerful Head.

I. Why should they desire to be under a lawless boundless Power? under a Head so notoriously perjured? If this seem harsh; let them seriously consider, what they in reason and conscience finde to excuse him from that charge, who binder himself by Oath in the Conclave, and then in the Papal Chair holds himself loose from what he sware to observe; who also swears to observe the Canons of the Ancient General Councils, yet will not keep within the bounds, they have set Him; but challenges and exercises an Universal Jurisdiction, to the overthrow of that Government, which those Canons have fixed in the way of the Church.

II. Why they should so much desire to be of the Communion of that Church, wch (while the Court of Rome is suffered

to

to define all, to over-rule all) is in so dangerous a condition. This will appear, if they consider:

First, that through the pretended infallibility of their Head, they can have no certain ground-work or Reason of their belief; but are in a way to lose all true Faith. For let the Cardinal *make the* Proposition: *If the Pope could Erre or turn Heretick, then would the Church be bound to this Absurdity or inconveniency of taking Vice for Vertue, Error for Truth. (This he plainly laies down in his 4. Book de* Pontifice, *and its good Doctrine in* Italy *and* Spain.) *Then let the* Gallican *Church and more Moderate Papists make the* Assumption: But the Pope may turn Heretick; *what can the* Conclusion *speak, but the hazard of that Church, which will be under such a pretended infallible Head?*

Secondly, That by being of that Communion they are taught to appropriate to themselves the Name of Catholick: *and thereby bound to an uncharitable condemning of all other Christians, and*

to

to a neceſsity of proving many Novel Errors, to be ancient Catholick Doctrine. We do not envie them, the Title of Catholicks, *that they ſhould enjoy it together withall other Chriſtians, who are baptized into the Catholick Faith, and do profeſs it without any deſtructive Hereſie; but the appropriating of that Title to themſelves, (and that in regard of thoſe ſpecial ſuperadded Articles of Faith, proper to that Church) implies all other Chriſtians to be no better then Hereticks, and excludes all conditions of Peace, unleſs they will come in, as the* Iſraelites *to* Naaſh, *with their* right eyes put out, 1 Sam. 11. *whereas upon due trial we may confidently affirm, it will appear, that no Church of known and ancient denomination, as* Greek, Aſian, African, Britiſh, *doth leſs deſerve to be called Catholick, or has more forfeited that Name: becauſe none ſo much falſified her truſt; whether we conſider the Errors entertained, or the Impoſing them as Catholick, and Chriſtian Faith.*

The

The three great concernments of Religion, and so of the Church are, the Faith *professed, the* Worship *practised, the* Sacraments *administred: all which are dangerously violated in that Church. For first, How have they kept the* Faith *undefiled, (which the* Athanasian *Creed so severely enjoyns) that have mixed it with such New superadded Articles, and lay the foundation of their belief upon the uncertain perswasion of a pretended Infallibility?*

Secondly, The Worship of God is there violated by the performing it in an unknown tongue; for without understanding the people cannot say Amen; *The prayer on their parts is but a* sacrifice of fools, *not a* reasonable service. *Again, Violated in yielding to the Creature an undue* religious service; *as may appear by what is said in the three first Chapters of this Book.*

Lastly, Sacraments *violated, by addition of New ones, and those properly so called. A great invasion it is upon Gods property, if any man or Church*

hold

hold out that for the Sacramental Sign and Instrument of Grace, which God who is the only Author of Grace, has not appointed to be so.

Again, upon that which our Saviour did undoubtedly institute, a great invasion is made, by first taking away the substance from the outward Elements, and then taking away from the people half of that, which remains. Our Saviour said, Drink ye all of it, *Mat. 26. 27. The Church of* Rome *saith* Ye shall not all Drink of it: *Nay, None of you shall, but the Priest only.*

Add to this, the Impossibility they put themselves upon (as I said) to prove all their New Articles of belief (for which they will be the only Catholicks) to be the Ancient Faith, and Catholick Doctrine of the Church. They will hardly be brought to say, The Church may make New Articles of Faith: but rather, The Church may declare, what was before but implicitly believed. This is true if duly explained: yet will it not excuse the boldness

of

of that Church. For when the Church declares any thing as of Faith, which was not expresly taught before, it is such a Truth, as was necessarily conteined and couched in the confessed Articles of the Creed, and by immediate consequence clearly thence deduceable; as the Consubstantiality of the Son, *declared against the* Arrians: *the* two Wills *in Christ, against the* Monothelites: *the continuance of the Humanity in its own nature and substance against the* Eutychians: *This is that which* Vincentius *saith in his 32. chap.* What else did the Church endeavour in the Decrees of Councils, but that, what before was simply believed, might afterward be more diligently and explicitly believed—— *And to shew that the Articles of faith do not increase in* Number, *but in the* dilatation *of more ample knowledge, He aptly uses the similitude of the several parts of the Natural body, which are as many in a childe as in a grown man; no addition made of new parts; for that would*

would render the body monstrous; but each part is dilated and augmented by degrees. To this purpose he, in his 29. chap. When therefore the Romanists can shew their Novel Articles by immediate and necessary consequence deduceable from the confessed Truthes of that Creed, into which we are baptized: then and not till then can we excuse this boldness in adding to the Christian Faith; & this uncharitable Pride in boasting themselves the only Catholicks.

III. May they consider, how their Masters being engaged in such necessity of making good the pretended Catholick Doctrine of that Church, are often forced to wink at the light and go on blindfold.

Their Masters acknowledg, and so does their Trent Council, that the worship of Saints and Angels, Invocation of them, Adoration of Images, is not commanded, but commended as profitable. Why then should Scripture be so oft alledged to deceive the unwary? why are they retained as profitable, when

Experience

Experience ſhews what a ſcandal *thereby given to Jews and Turks; what* offence *to ſo many Chriſtians as pro againſt them? what a* ſtumbling blo *to their own people, expoſed thereby the danger of Idolatry?*

They acknowlege, that our Savio inſtituted the Sacrament and admin ſtred it in both kindes; and that it w ſo from the beginning received a practiſed in the whole Church, yet w not the Court of Rome *ſuffer the pe ple ſo to receive it. And in their d fence of this half Communion, they a knowledge, if the Church alter any thi in or about the Sacraments, yet it m be* Salvâ illorum ſubſtantia, *ſavi their ſubſtance,* Concil. Trid. ſeſ. 2 c. 2. *which notwithſtanding, they c take away the whole ſubſtance of the E ments, and defraud the people of t half of what is left: and notwithſta ding our Saviours Inſtitution, and t Cuſtom of the whole Church for ſo m ny ages:* This cuſtom muſt be hel for a Law, which none may contr ry: *as that Council decrees in the ſa chap.*

The

They acknowledge, it is fit the people mmunicate *with the Priest in every* Masss i. e. *they acknowledge it is fit* ere *should be no* private Masses, *and* ey *wish it were so, and yet decree* e *contrary*, cap. 6. de Missa. *So* ey *acknowledge the Mass conteins* magnam populi eruditionem) *great* ification *and instruction for the peo-* e; *yet decree it* not expedient to ve it (*or the Liturgy*) in the popu- or vulgar tongue, cap. 8. *But if* e *Court of* Rome *had seen it equally* their *advantage, they could have* d *the people to that which they ought,* the *Communion, as well as keep all* eir *Priests from that, which they ought* ', viz. *Marriage.*

They acknowledge that Justification eedes *good Works.* Sess. 6. c. 8. *yet* liver *this doctrine* (Justified by orks) *grosly to the People; They* om, *how it is to their advantage.* nd *in the* 16. *chap. of that Session,* ey *acknowledge the grace of God for* formance *of the work, and his gra-* us *promise of the reward: yet de-*

cree,

cree, that good works do truly
rit.

Add to this, their mincing of
of doctrine, when they are put
As when the enquiry is driven
what worship is due to Saints and
gels. What Invocation to be
What worship or adoration to be
ven to Images. We see how they
it, and seem to be contented with
little, as we observe in Mr. Spen
concessions upon those points:
they keep up the practise, in the
and full extent, suffering (if not
couraging) the people to perfor
grossly and superstitiously: as they
needs do, being unapable of such
distinctions, as are used to excuse
worship.

So when they are put to it in
points of Satisfactions, Purgato
Indulgences, to shew what is sati
for, what is remitted, and consequ
what is granted in the Indulgence,
to what sort of Persons; they are
ced to bring it to such an uncerta
and to so small a scantling, that
pe

ple, if they knew it, would consider
what they laid out that way, before
parted with it; but these points are
gross propounded to the people, that
have cause to think (as generally
do) they are by these satisfactions
indulgences freed from any sin, and
escape thereby Hell fire it self.
This which has been said, speaks
cessions and yieldings on their part,
shewes a possibility of agreement,
that some fair way might be found
some tolerable accord: did not fil-
lucre, gotten by those points, and the
rbitant greatness of Papal power ob-
uct it: the Court of Rome (as we see
all the offers made for reformation)
ing always more sollicitous of uphol-
ng it self, then of reforming the
hurch: of advancing its own great-
s, then of promoting the peace of
ristendom.

To conclude. The peace of Chri-
ans, the agreement of the Roman
d other Churches is possible, if it be
sible for the Pope to do his duty, or
ristian Princes, theirs: that is, if
be

he would do the duty of a Bishop
Rome, or prime Patriarch, the
he is bound to, sworn to, in taking
to observe the Canons of the Ant
General Councils, which prescribe
bounds of the Roman, and other
triarchal Jurisdictions. But if
make light of this and all other b
of duty, why should it not be pos
for Christian Princes to do their
in reducing him within those kn
and confessed bounds, fixed by the
cient Church?

In the mean time, let them cease
reproach us with Schism, till he ret
to his station, where he may receive
obedience due to him by those Anci
Canons: let them rather consider, wh
they follow, in all his transgressions
extravagances, thereby engaging the
selves in his Schism against the wh
Catholick Church. And let them
please themselves with the specious Na
of Catholicks, for holding such poi
of Difference from other Christians,
will upon trial appear to be far fr
the Truth and soundness of Catholi
Doctri

Doctrine. *And to make this appear by the undeniable Rules of Christian Verity,* Scripture, *and* Catholick Tradition, (*as they are solidly set down by* Vincentius) *is the scope and purpose of this ensuing Treatise. If any of their Masters shall think fit to make any Reply, let him do it, not as one carping at small things, and catching at seeming advantages: but as one really intending the Manifestations of* Truth, *and the Expedients of* Peace: *the restoring of which, throughout the* Catholick Church, *is the Prayer of*

H. Ferne.

The

The Points of Doctrine here Examined.

I. *Of the worship of Saints and Angels.*

II. *Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels.*

III. *Of the worship of Images.*

IV. *Of Justification by Works.*

V. *Of the Merit of Good Works.*

VI. *Of Purgatory.*

VII. *Of Real Presence.*

VIII. *Of Communion under one kinde.*

An Answer to Mr. *Spencers* Book INTITULED, CRIPTURE MISTAKEN By the Protestants.

CHAP. I.

The first Point.

Of the Worship of Saints and Angels.

Introduction.

THis Author first tells us, what the Council of *Trent* delivers touching the Worship and invocation of Saints and Angels, *not as Gods or Saviours, but as Creatures dependent on God and Christ* — and *that it is not commanded as necessary*, but *commended* as profitable — and this, *to disabuse vulgar Protestants, who think the Roman Church teaches, it is as necessary to salvation, to invoke and worship the Saints, as to invoke and worship Christ himself* — Pag. 3. 4.

The Council indeed touches this poin warily, and in general: which circum ſpection and cunning we finde uſed i moſt of the decrees; they beſt kno wherefore. But *Vulgar Proteſtants* are n abuſed, when they are told, that accor ding to the practice of that Church (if w look into the applications made to Sain and their ſhrines, both for the *forms* a the *frequency*) there appears not much that dependency on Chriſt, but ver much of an opinion (connived at, if n rather cheriſhed) among the Vulgar P piſts, that it is as neceſſary and profitabl if not more, to invoke and worſhip the then Chriſt himſelf. But if they will co mend this as profitable, why did not t Council for the diſabuſing their own pe ple, condemn thoſe unprofitable, poiſ nous forms of invocation yet extant their books, and uſed in their Churche why has it not yet anathematiz'd th blaſphemous *Lady Pſalter*, and that ho rid doctrine, broached by *Aquinas*, a ſtill maintained by moſt of this Aut ho ſociety, that the *Image is to be worſhipp* * *with the ſame worſhip, with which he whoſe Image it is?* So that if it be t Image of Chriſt it is to be worſhiped wi divine worſhip. The † *Cardinal* ackno ledges, *they which ſpeak ſo, are forced*

* *Greg. de Val. in Tho. diſput.* VI. *Qu.* XI. *punct.* 6. Azor. *Inſtit. Mor. To.* I. *li.* 9. *c.* 6. *qu.* 5.

† Bel. *de Imaginib. l.* 2. *c.* 22.

uſe diſtinctions, which they themſelves ſcarce underſtand, much leſs the people: So that Mr. *Spencer* had need look home, to *diſabuſe* his own people.

The firſt place of Scripture.

Matth. 4. 10. *Thou ſhalt worſhip*, the *Lord thy God*, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.

Numb. I. The queſt. is about Religious worſhip.

Here he needleſly ſpends time in ſhewing, that *worſhip and ſervice* may be given to others beſides God; and therefore notes it as a double miſtake of the Proteſtants, to infer from this place that worſhip and ſervice are only due to God: *pag.* 5. &c.

It ſeems he was bound to make up his tale or number of miſtakes, he does ſo cauſeleſly faſten them upon the Proteſtants: for he knows they do not argue from this place, that all kinds of worſhip or ſervice are to be given to God only: but that kind of worſhip, which according to his own expreſſion, *pag.* 8. is performed *by an act of Religion*: i. e. *religious* worſhip: or as S. *Aug.* gives us the *limitation of that* Word *Worſhip*, and indeed the determination of the queſtion, that if we *add Religion* to that word, then it ſpeaks that *worſhip*, which is due to God only. This Author knew well enough that Proteſtants confine their

Aug. de C. v. l. 10. c. 1.

diſpute here to a *Religous worſhip*: and he ſpeaks it *pa.* 11. *that this place* Mat. 4. 10. *muſt according to Proteſtants be underſtood to forbid only religious worſhip to any ſave God:* and therefore applies himſelf under his ſecond pretended miſtake to the conſideration of it, endeavouring to finde out ſuch a worſhip given to Creatures, as may be call'd *Religious.* All that he brings we ſhall ſee very far ſhort of the purpoſe, altogether inſufficient to excuſe their practice, or anſwer what we charge them with, for their encroachments upon the Worſhip and Service due to God, in the way of *Religion.*

II. The Acts of Worſhip inward and outward.

The firſt thing we need take notice of is his premiſing the diſtinction of Worſhip, into *Interior* & *Exterior*, as ſubſervient to his purpoſe, (*pa.* 12.) telling us (*pa.* 13.) The *External deportment, proſtration, may be the very ſame, when we worſhip God, or Saint, or Angel, Biſhop, Apoſtle, King, Magiſtrate, Father, Mother: yet they become different kinds of Worſhip, according to the different humiliations, intentions, and acknowledgments which he who worſhips, deſires to expreſs by thoſe outward deportments of the body.* It is true that the *inward intent* makes the difference in the worſhip given, when the outward act is the ſame, though not allwaies

alwaies *ſo different a kinde of worſhip*, as he would have the worſhip of Saints and Angels to be, in regard of the *Civil* worſhip and honour, as we ſhall ſee below. But here note (for there will be uſe of it hereafter) that in all this diſcourſe of *worſhip* he only inſiſts in ſuch outward expreſſions, as properly fall under the word (προσκύνασις) as *bowing*, *kneeling*, *proſtration*, which are indeed common to the worſhip of God and Creatures: but there are other, which both in Scripture and in the nature of the thing, appear proper to God, and the worſhip due to him, *Altars*, *burning incenſe*, *oblations*, nuncupation of *Vows*; upon which ſcore we may finde the Church of Rome faulty, as in doctrine, ſo much more in practice. The * Cardinal having ſaid, the *external acts are common to all worſhip*, makes his exception, *of ſacrifices, and thoſe † things which have relation to them*: And *Greg. de Val.* acknowledges it of *Prayer*, *Oblations*, *Sacrifices*, &c. *that they immediately belong to Religion, and do peculiarly contain a certain ſubjection of the creature to God.*

Some Acts of worſhip proper to God.

* *Bel. de Beat. ſanctorum l.* 1. c 12: † *Greg. de Val. in Tho.* 2. 2. *Diſp* 6. *qu.* 5. *de virt. Religionis punct.* 2.

The ſecond thing we are to take notice of, is that to lay ſome ground-work for raiſing ſuch a worſhip on, as they give to Saints and Angels, he ſets himſelf to ſhew,

III. Excellency & Dignity how the Reaſon of Honour and Worſhip.

that beſides the *Civil* and *Divine* dignities or excellencies, there is a third ſort neither infinite as the *Divine*, nor humane as the *Civil*; but *Spiritual* and *Supernatural*, and would make his Readers believe that *all the difficulty in this matter conſiſts in ſhewing, there are three worths or excellencies to be acknowledged and honoured by an act of worſhip*, pag. 14. Whereas we grant ſuch ſupernatural excellencies in Angels and Men, and that there ought to be an acknowledgment and honour in the mind commenſurate to ſuch a worth or excellency, and that to be expreſſed by ſuch acts as are fitting: and we believe that the Romaniſts have not ſuch an acknowledgment in their minds when they worſhip Saint or Angel, as they have when they worſhip God Almighty: but whether that acknowledgment they have, be commenſurate to created Excellencies, and no more, they know beſt: We cannot but ſay, the expreſſions they make of it in the ſeveral particulars of their Religious Worſhip, do too plainly ſhew, they yield them more devotion of ſoul then is due to meer Creatures, entrenching far upon the religious worſhip and ſervice due to God.

The

IV. Of the words Religion, and Religious worſhip.

The third thing we take notice of is, that albeit he ſaid, *All the difficulty conſisted in clearing the third ſort of worth or excellency to be acknowledged and honoured*; yet he knew well enough, the difficulty ſtood not in that, but in the acknowledging and honouring them with *acts of Religious worſhip*. And therefore (*pa.*20,21.) he ſets himſelf to diſtinguiſh of the words, *Religion* and *Religious*, that among all the acceptions of thoſe words mentioned in Scripture, he might finde ſome, according to which, the worſhip of Saints and Angels may be called *Religious*.

Religion (ſaith he pa.20.) *may be taken either in a ſtrict ſenſe, for the vertue of Religion*: So *when the School Doctors diſpute about the nature of infuſed graces*; or *largely, for the whole belief or profeſſion of thoſe that eſteem themſelves to have the true way of ſerving God*: ſo when *we ſay*, the *Religion of the Chriſtians, or of the Jews*: having thus diſtinguiſhed, he determins (pa.22.) *It will be ſufficient for the defenſe of the Cathol. Roman faith in this point: to affirm, that when the Doctors ſay, that any thing created may be or is worſhipped with religious worſhip, it is religious in the larger ſenſe*: i. e. *vertuous, pious, Chriſtian, as belonging and proper to our Religion, and tending*

finally to the acknowledgment of God and our Saviours honour, as Author of our faith and religion, and *pa.* 23. inſtances in *Levit.*7.6. where the giving of the breſt and ſhoulder of the ſacrifice to the Prieſt is call'd *a perpetual religion in their generations*; and then in *Ia.* 1. *ult.* where a work of mercy done to the poor (to a Creature) is called *Religion*, i. e. *proceeding from and belonging to Religion*. But this, together with all the inſtances he can give of *Religion* or *Religious* in ſuch a ſenſe, comes not home either to the thing in queſtion, (*Religious worſhip*) or *to defence* of his *Catholick Roman Church*, attributing more to Saints and Angels, then he can bring out of Scripture or Fathers either, either to parallel or excuſe it. For upon examination, and for reaſons following, it will appear plainly, that the worſhip as by them allowed and performed to Saints and Angels, muſt be call'd *Religious*, according to his firſt and ſtricter ſenſe of *Religion*, and ſo by his own confeſſion undue to Creatures.

But before we come to our reaſons let us hear how *Greg. de Val.* expreſſes this matter a little more clearly. He ſpeaking of the Acts of the *vertue of Religion* (as the *School* calls it) tells us ſome of them pertain

Val. in Tho. 2. 2a. diſp. 6. qu. 1. punct. 2.

pertain to it *remotè* & *imperativè*, remotely and only as commanded by it; (this with Mr. *Spencer* is *religious* in the larger ſenſe:) ſome pertain to it *proximè* & *elicitive*, immediately, and more inwardly proceeding from it, and declaring a ſubjection due to God; ſuch acts are *prayers, oblations, ſacrifices, vows*, &c. This is *religious* in Mr. *Spencers* firſt and ſtricter ſenſe: accordingly the Schoolmen treat of thoſe particulars, as Acts or immediate exerciſes of the vertue of religion. Now albeit *Valentia*, and Mr. *Spencer* and all of them affirm, that *religious* worſhip according to this ſenſe, is due only to God: which is a great truth; and do deny, that the worſhip they give to any creature is to be called *religious* ſo: or that it pertains to *religion* in that ſtricter ſenſe; which is alſo true, as to many things they do to Saints and Angels, (being not ſo much as *remotè* and *imperativè*, by way of command from true *religion*) yet as uſed and exerciſed by them, thoſe acts of their worſhip are *interpretativè*, acts of *religion* according to the firſt ſenſe: ſo to be interpreted and accounted of as to them, and their performance: as all undue and miſapplied worſhip, given to the Creature in way and exerciſe of *religion*, yea given to a falſe God, is to be

accounted of. This will appear in the reaſons following.

V. How the Romiſh creature-worſhip muſt be accounted religious. *Azor.* Inſtit. Mor. part. 1. l. 9. c. 10. qu. 2.

The firſt reaſon ſhall be that which *Azorius* (one of the ſame Society) gives, becauſe, the virtue of *religion* is not of *two kindes*, one which gives God his worſhip, and another which gives worſhip to Saints, their Images and Reliques. And they (ſaith he) that think *religion* is not of one kind, are moved by the reaſon of the ſeveral kindes *of dignities and excellencies* in things; (this was Mr. *Spencer* reaſon of his ſeveral ſorts of worſhip, above nu. 3. and ſo it is *Bellarmines* reaſon) but religion (ſaith *Azor*) is not a virtue which generally gives to any one worſhip *for the excellency*, but which gives Divine worſhip and honour to God: and therefore the virtue *of religion* does not honour and worſhip *whatſoever excelleth*, but *whatſoever is Divine*, and as it *is Divine*: wherefore as *God is but one*, ſo *religion* is but one in kinde. Now this is very true and rational, and concludes all religious worſhip to be Divine, and only due to God: and that albeit there be an honour due to *ſuch excellencies*, (an *honour commenſurate* to them) yet not *a religious worſhip*.

* *Non igitur religio, quicquid excellit, honorat & colit, ſed quicquid divinum eſt, et quâ ratione divinum eſt: quemadmodum ergò unus Deus eſt, ſic una quoque ſpecie religio eſt.* Azor. ibid.

But what will *Azorius* then ſay to the *religious worſhip* given to Saints and their Images

Images in the Church of *Rome*? It is the objection immediately following, and he anſwers not by mincing the matter, as moſt of his fellowes do, by ſaying it is *religious* in a *remote* or a *large ſenſe*, ſuch a ſenſe as (conſidering what they do, and allow in that Church) ſpeaks nothing to the purpoſe; or by ſaying it is an act of *ſpecial obſervance*, as *Greg. de Val.* would leſſen it to no purpoſe, as ſee below, num. 8. or by other frivolous diſtinctions uſed by them in this point of worſhip: No. He ſeemed to conſider what is done and allowed in their Church, and that all ſuch excuſes help not: therefore * he ſaith down right, (and ſaith it often in this chapt.) that it is *Divine* (which in Mr. *Spencers* ſtrict ſenſe is *religious*) honour and worſhip which is given to Saints, in *erecting Altars, Offering*, making *vowes* to them, *invoking of them*, &c. and excuſes it from Idolatry by ſaying it is given them, *not for themſelves*, but for *Gods ſake*, that made them ſuch. But there is enough in *Greg. de Val.* and *Bell.* and other *Romiſh* writers to ſhew, that *divine honour* given to the creature, though with ſuch reference to God cannot be defended: which is a great truth; ſo then between theſe truths the Church of *Rome* muſt be in a great ſtrait; it gives and allowes

* *Sanctos honoramus non ſolum eo cultu quo homines virtute & dignitate præſtantes, ſed etiam divino cultu, qui eſt actus religionis — Sed divinos cultus & honores non damus ſanctis propter ſeipſos ſed propter deum, qui eos ſanctos effecit.* Azor. ibid. qu. 5.

lowes according to what *Azorius* proved a divine and religious worship to creatures, and according to the truth that the other deliver, it cannot be defended in it.

Second reason. What does religion in Mr. *Spencers* strict sense sound, but the virtue and devotion of the heart which sends out such expressions of subjection and worship in the exercises of religion and what is the Romish worship but the exercise of that devotion or *religion* which is in the heart of any Romanist so desiring to express it self? and how is it expressed and performed but by their addresses to God, Saints, Angels by the former acts of Religion, *Prayers*, *Praises*, *Vows*, *Offerings*? Look into their offices private, publick: observe what is done at their Altars, Shrines, Images: what *prayers*, *offerings*, *vows* made there! see their *incense burned* before an Image, which is a *consumptive oblation*, and as much as was done to the *brazen Serpent*: and as for *Prayer*, (one of the Acts of *religion*) under it * *Valentia* puts their dayly recital of the *office*, which contains prayers to Saints and Angels; and therefore this worship by *prayers*, *vows*, to Saints in their way of religion must belong to religion in the first sense, as immediate exercises thereof.

* Val. disp. 6. qu. 2. de oratione punct. 10.

Third-

Thirdly, they do not only uſe thoſe immediate *acts of religion, prayers, praiſes, vows:* giving them to Saints in their exerciſe of religion: but in theſe religious acts *joyn* the Saints with God: which *Athanaſius* makes an Argument of the unity of the Son with the Father, elſe he could not be joyned with him in prayers; — in praying συνάπτειν τῷ πατρὶ & ἐπικοινωνεῖν, to *joyn* the Son to the Father, which he denies to all creatures — ſo when St. *Paul* prayes — 1 *Theſſ.* 3. 11. Now *God himſelf and our Lord Jeſus direct*, &c. Now ſee how in the Church of *Rome* they *joyn* the Saints with God: in their *vows*, as at entrance into ſome religious orders; *I vow to God and the bleſſed Virgin*; in their *Praiſes* that Pſalm or Hymn *venite adoremus*, is in ſome of their books thrice broken, by *Ave Maries* inſerted: *Bellar.* and *Valentia* cloſe ſome of their books thus, *Laus Deo & Beatæ Virgini, praiſe to God and the bleſſed Virgin*; and as I remember in the *Lyons Edition Bellarm.* cloſes his book *de cultu Sanctorum*, thus, *Laus Deo, Virginiq; Mariæ, Jeſu item Chriſto:* praiſe be to God, and to the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, alſo to Jeſus Chriſt the Eternal Son of God; the like is done by *Valentia* at the end of ſome of his books. Now what is this but to ſet her if not

Athan. Or. 4. contra Arianos.

Pſal. 95.

not in equal rank with God, yet sure as high as the *Collyridians* did? And what can this import but religion in the first sense? A presumptuous entrenching on what is due to God.

Fourthly, when they divide worship into *Latria* and *Dulia*, it is not a Division of the word *worship* at large (as when it is divided into religious and civil) but it is a division of *religious worship*, given by them with this distinction, to God and the creature, in the way and exercise of their religion: also the word *service* implied in *Dulia*, being not a civil service with them, necessarily implies a *religious service*; such as God forbids to be given to creatures: also when they affirm the same worship given to the Image of Christ, as to Christ, is it not *religious* in the high sense? The defenders of this take ground from their known Church Hymn. *Hail O Cross, our only hope*, &c. as the * *Cardinal* acknowledges, and would shift it off by many figures in the speech.

* Bel. l. de Imag c. 19. fundamenta.

Lastly, when they pray to God, which they grant is the exercise of religion in the strict sense, they acknowledge they do it by the mediation of Saints and Angels prayed unto for that purpose: and what is this else but a performing of the creature-worship out of the virtue of religion, and

nd in way of religious offices or devoti-
ns, in and together with, and in order
o a worſhipping of God, at the ſame time
egging of God the gift of mercy, and
egging the Saints mediation, for pre-
enting that prayer, or joyning his inter-
eſſion with it?

As for his large and lax ſenſe of *religi-*
us for that *which proceeds from and belongs*
o religion, it is ſo general that it brings in
ll the duties of the ſecond table, as that
ct of mercy he inſtanced in out of *Ja.* 1.
ult. And here by that and his other in-
ſtance out of *Lev.* 7. 6. we might expect,
if he will have this creature-worſhip any
way belong to religion, he ſhould have
ſhowen it commanded by God, as thoſe
two particulars were which he brought as
inſtances: but it is the profeſſion of this
Author in the name of his Church, that it
is not commanded but *commended as good*
and profitable: i. e. as invented and taken
up of themſelves, and *pertaining to, and*
proceeding from religion, i. e. the religion
of the *Romiſh Church*, far from being *Ca-*
tholick in this point; indeed if we ſpeak of
a worſhip due to Saints and Angels, that
is, an acknowledgement and honour we
owe them, anſwerable to the worth and
excellency in them: it is a duty or thing
commanded, and ſo *religious* in that large
ſenſe,

VI. Religious in their large ſenſe not excuſe their creature-worſhip.

ſenſe, by the fifth commandment; yea, a
tends finally to Gods honour, as the Auth
of all gifts and excellencies in the creatur
And we are ready to expreſs this inwa
acknowledgment or honour (and do
ſufficiently) by celebrating their mem
ries, by thankſgiving to God for them, b
propoſing their vertuous examples f
imitation; but as for the worſhip th
perform and plead for, whatever inwar
acknowledgment they pretend to ha
commenſurate to the worth of thoſe gl
rious creatures, yet ſuch are the acts the
expreſs it by, as do plainly ſhew it a wo
ſhip neither commanded nor comme
ded, nor conſiſtent with that worſhi
which we finde commanded, thoſe ac
and acknowledgments of honour and ſub
jection, which God requires in his wo
ſhip.

Laſtly, the examples he brings out o
Scripture for countenancing his worſhip
who ſees not how far they fall ſhort o
what he ſhould prove? They are of *Lot*
bowing to the Angels that came unto
him; and of the *Shunamite* worſhipping
Eliſha, and the Captain of fifty, *Elias*,
p. 25. and this he will have *religious* wor-
ſhip, becauſe of their *Authorities derived*
and acknowledged only from faith and reli-
gion. Be it ſo: and that they had a mo-
tive

e for that worſhip more then *meerly* *vil*: we need not fear if it be call'd *reli-* *us* in ſo large and remiſs a ſenſe, *viz.* h a *religious* worſhip or reverence as is en to *holy men living*. But I would this Author, if it would not be held ominable in the Church of *Rome*, to e unto any *holy men living*, the wor- p and ſervice they do to Saints depart- : as to erect Altars, Temples to them, l down before their Images, burn in- enſe to them, make vows and prayers them at any diſtance, and in the ſame rms, and in the ſame place and time, here and when they do to God?

VII. Mr. *Spencers* mincing of the matter.

Well, leaving this for him to think of: ar how he concludes this diſcourſe, *pag.* 7. where (to the praiſe of his ingenuity, t prejudice of his undertaking) he ith: *If any wilfully deny all kind of re-* *ious worſhip, in how large a ſenſe ſoever,* *be lawfully exhibited to any ſave God a-* *one; ſo long as he yields the thing it* *ſelf, that is, to exhibit reverence and wor-* *ip to perſons and things, in acknowledg-* *ment of the ſupernatural gifts and graces* *and bleſſings of God, wherewith they are* *enriched: let him call that worſhip Chri-* *ſtian, or pious, or an extraordinary rank* *of civil worſhip, I ſhall not contend about* *the name, when the thing is done.* This is fair,

fair, if he deal plainly, and do not ex
(by ſeeming to be content *with the t*
we yield,) ſuch a *thing* as they mak
this worſhip; for we are ready to *y*
the thing that is due: that is a revere
and honour commenſurate to their ex
lency: as much or more then was g
to holy men living: and to do it b
προσκύνησις (a bowing or proſtratio
where it can be done: to an Angel
viſibly appearing to us as to *Lot.*
as for the Saints departed, they are
by reaſon of their abſence, capable
that which was given to holy men livi
but we are willing to expreſs the hon
we owe them, as we can: by com
morating and praiſing their vertues,
pounding their examples for imitat
And if we muſt properly ſpeak, what
worſhip is, which they exhibit to
Saints departed, it muſt be call'd *ſuper*
tion, which as the notation of the wo
ſhews, is a worſhip of the dead exhibi
to them by thoſe that overlive them,
remain after them; or as *Lactantius* te
us, they are call'd * *ſuperſtitious,*
worſhip or religiouſly honour the remain
memory of the dead, and celebrate (or h
nour with religious ſervice) *their Ima*
And now let this Author if he can, *defe*
his Catholick Roman Church in her p
tend

Superſtition.

* *Superſtitioſi ſunt, qui ſuperſtitem memoriam defunctorum colunt, eorumque Imagines celebrant. Inſtit. l. 4. c. 28.*

ded *religious* worſhip, from this charge *uperſtition*: and then conſider if ſhe be alſo ſo far chargeable with *Idolatrous ctice*, as thoſe applications to Saints Angels, thoſe expreſſions of worſhip ich they make by *vows*, *oblations*, *pray-* and *adorations*, ſhall be fouud to yield the creature any thing proper to God.

To conclude, we have ſeen how the VIII. worſhip, which they religiouſly, but un- The honour ly give to Saints and Angels ſtands due to arged: now if for the perfecting of this Saints and courſe, it be enquired to what ſort of Angels of what ſort is worſhip, that honour, which we acknow- it? ge due to Saints and Angels (*the thing*, ich he ſaid, *we yield*) may indeed be duced: we have two ſorts of worſhip parent and unqueſtionable, *Divine* and *vil*: the *divine* is due to God by reaſon his ſupereminent majeſty, and by rea- n of his dominion over the whole man, d contains all the religious worſhip and rvice, all the obedience man can give m according to any of his commands, the honour he can return him upon y due occaſion. The *civil*, is due to an upon that dominion he has over o- ers according to the outward man and affairs of this life, and contains the ho- our, ſubjection, and obedience due to Magiſtrate, Maſters, Parents. Between theſe

theſe two, the Cardinal (whom th
thor follows every where) fixes the
ſhip or honour due to a finite ſuper
ral excellency, ſuch as is in Saints and
gels: And it is true, that if we giv
creature no more then is commenſ
or due unto it, the honour given wi
be a *Divine or Religious*, nor yet a
worſhip properly, becauſe given wit
reſpect to dominion or ſubjection.
there is a worſhip or honour due to
ſons (to whom we owe not ſubject
as they are endowed with qualities
excellencies, though not ſupernatura
Wiſdome, *Learning*, *Juſtice*, and
Vertues: which worſhip is not *Di*
or *Civil* properly, but as ſome ca
the worſhip or honour of *Moral*
rence due to all moral vertuous end
ments; or as others *Cultus offici*
officious, or out of courteſy. So like
the honour due to gracious and ſuper
tural gifts and qualities, may thoug
a higher degree be call'd the honou
moral reverence, making but one ki
of both, becauſe the motive or gro
of both is a thing of moral perſwa
ariſing from the worth and excellenc
gifts and endowments without the re
of dominion.

Gr

Greg. de Val. has a phraſe for it not hdiffering; telling us, the worſhip due aints, is not an act of religion *immedi-* ly, but *ſingularis obſervantiæ*, of a ſingu- obſervance, or reſpect to ſaints; & that not religion *immediately*, which pro- es them that eſteem, commenſurate to ellent Creatures; but *peculiaris obſer-* tia, i.e. that ſpecial obſervance & reve- ce wch. ſuch excellencies deſerve. Now is to ſpeak what is due to ſaints, not t the Romaniſts allow them, or ſuffer r people to give them: wch. often falls the way and acts of Religion, by their s, *prayers*, *raiſe*, *oblations* to Saints.

Val. *in Thom.* 2. 2. *diſput.* 6. *qu.* 11. *punct.* 5.

That this worſhip or honour (which be call'd an act of *moral reverence* or *officiouſneſs*, or of *ſpecial obſervance*, hey pleaſe) is of a differing kind, m the *religious* or *divine*, and may be erenced from the *civil* or humane, not be denied; but if asked, to ich of the two it is reducible, or ana- ical, we ſay to the *civil*. For gifts virtues which for their *principle* and iginal are *ſupernatural*, are for their *civil*, *i. e.* for the good of the *con-* *ves*, fellow Citizens, members of the me *ſociety* of the Church; yea Saints d Angels are *concives* fellow Citizens h us, *Eph.* 2. 19. So that *civil* wor-

ſhip

ſhip might be divided, into that *h* *civil* according to the Polity of the w and this of *moral reverence*, which i *logically civil* according to the Pol the Church ſociety. But they mu duce it to Religious worſhip which divided into *Latria* and *Dulia*, as a here its made *medius cultus*, a m worſhip between *Divine* and *Civ* the Cardinal and they all do, to it nearer to the *Divine*; and the make it intrench upon the *divine* o *gious* worſhip by ſuch applications expreſſions as we heard above. A their uſual ſtarting hole (to which commonly retire in this point of wor ping of Saints, Angels, Images,) to they have no ſuch acknowledgme them, as of Gods, or infinit excelle it will not ſecure them; ſo long as yeild them ſome acknowledgment commenſurate to them, and expr by ſuch acts and exerciſes of reli worſhip as above ſaid. We ſhall the Heathens made the like excuſe the worſhip, they gave to the inferio ities, and to their Images. Nor the people have ſuch a conceit of *M* dead body or carcaſs, as of an Inf and divine excellency, which yet hid from them, *leaſt they ſhould ma*

Bel. de Beat. Sanctor. l. 1. c. 12.

l of it, as the *Cardinal* saith*; that leaſt they ſhould do to it, and give it h acts of worſhip, as the Church of *ne* doth to Angels, to Saints, and to r Reliques.

* *Bel. Apol. pro reſponſ. ſua ad Reg. Jacob. cap* 8. Sect. *jam. vero.*

Now leaſt there ſhould be made ſome tences of plea from what the Author of ſupernatural worſhip and excel- y, which he ſeemed to raiſe not only n *ſupernatural gifts and graces*, but upon that *dignity and authority* which ore then humane or Civil, and truly him call'd *Eccleſiaſtical*, ſuch as was *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*: and withall ntioned ſeveral places of Scripture, to ly the dignity and authority in the ts and Angels, as 1 *Cor.* 6. 2. that *ſhall judge the world*—Rev. 5. 19. *they ſhall reign* upon the earth. And the Angels were *Promulgators of the w*, Act. 7. 53. *Captains of the Armies od*, Jos. 5. 14.. *Controlers of King- es*, Dan. 10. 12. So he *pa.* 17. 18. I leaſt by this *Authority* which he ns to aſcribe to them, he ſhould im- (for he does not plainly infer) a ſub- ion to them, and upon that account, ty of worſhip: therefore to exclude retences; It may be ſaid 1. That in phets and Apoſtles there was a *dignity uthority* as well as excellency of grace and

IX.

Of the Authority and Rule, that Saints and Angels are ſaid to have over us.

and holiness: and still there is such *thority* in the Bishops and Pastors of Church; and that Authority not C properly, but *Ecclesiastical*; and u that Authority a subjection due to t (*Heb.* 13. 17.) in things pertainin Religion and Conscience; and the nour or worship thereupon due to th as it may in his large sense be called *gious* (which we every where grant w out prejudice to our, or advantage to Cause) so may it better be call'd the *Ecclesiastical* worship, because as in world, so in the Church there is a po or government: for the Church bel as a *City* and society within it self, does also with that above make up whole City of God. Therefore are call'd by the Apostle (*Concives*) *fello tizens* Eph. 2. But 2ly, Albeit Sa and Angels belong to the higher par this City, the triumphant, and as to state they enjoy are of higher dignity glory then any in the militant, or part low: yet being not capable of that c duct of souls as the Governours and stors in the lower city are, they can challenge that subjection from us, nor worship that arises upon it; Nor they by reason of their distance rece from us those tenders of worship and

n

our which are applied to holy men li-
ng. *S. *Aug.* determins it thus: *We honor the Martyrs with that worſhip of love and fellowſhip, wherewith Holy men in this life are worſhiped: Of fellowſhip*—— with reference to the Apoſtles *fellow-citizens*, and of *holy men living*, with reference to *ſupernatural gifts* and graces, and the honour thence ariſing; ſuch as we give to men upon the account of holineſs and ſuch graces, though they have no authority over us; and let the Saints departed have all ſuch honour (inward and outward) that they are capable of. Laſtly, If this Author will drive thoſe places of Scripture he cited for authority of Saints and Angels, ſo far as to prove the worſhip due which they give unto them: as his Mr. the Cardinal endeavoured by the like places to defend the invoking of them: He may take anſwer from S. *Aug.* determining what manner of worſhip is due unto them, as above (*the worſhip of love and fellowſhip,*) and * elſwhere, *the worſhip of charity not ſubjection or ſervice*; from S. *Paul Eph.* 2. ſaying we are *fellow-Citizens*; or from the Angel, Rev. *I am thy fellow-ſervant*: And if they will but make uſe of ſuch places as this Author hath alleaged, it will be eaſie to ſhew how inconſequent the argument is from ſuch

* *Eo cultu dilectionis & ſocietatis quo in hac vita Sancti homines. contra Fauſt. l. 20. l. 21.*

* *Charitatis non ſervitutis. Aug. de vera Relig. c. 55.*

places of Scripture, how inſufficient prove ſuch a worſhip as is allowed by Church of Rome.

X. Recapitul. of the premiſes.

To conclude, This Author will not we are *miſtaken*, when we affirm, all worſhip properly *religious*, and acc ding to his firſt and ſtricter ſenſe, is to God, and not to be exhibited to Creature; Nor can he ſay we are *mi ken*, in proving that truth by this Sc pture, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord*, unleſs he will deny this Scripture ſpe of worſhip properly *religious*. It rem then, that our miſtake (if any) muſt in concluding by this Scripture, their c ture-worſhip to be unlawful. That we not herein miſtaken appears by what been ſaid already; Firſt, by that whi ſaid above to ſhew the worſhip they hibit, by *Oblations*, *Incenſe*, *Invoca Vows*, *adoration of Images*, belongs muſt be reduced to that ſort of worſ which is proper to *Religion*, in the and ſtricter ſenſe. Not only the *effe* Religion but *part* of it, I mean as per med and miſapplyed by them; an would it were not the greater *part* their Religion. Secondly, by the inſu ciency of what this Author has ſaid to contrary, in putting off the imputa from themſelves, and faſtning the mi

on us: As first, his pretence from the immediate signification or bare importance of the word (προσκυνήσεις) in the text; which speaks a bowing or prostration of the body, and is common to the *religious* and the *civil* worship, to the worship of God and the Creature: and accordingly all the instances and examples he brought, speak no more then that outward reverence and worship shewen in bowing the body: Whereas this comes not home to our charge laid upon their worship, and cautioned against by this Scripture: *viz.* their worship exhibited to creatures by the above said acts, and exercises of religion and devotion: Secondly, his pretence of *religious* in his larger sense as sufficient, which is as short of the purpose as the former; for so all the duties of the second Table (as we saw above) may be called *religious*, i. e. pertaining to, and commanded by Religion; but here we speak of the acts of worship proper to *religion*, or exhibited in the way and exercises of Religion and Devotion; which in their worship are such, as are proper to the worship of God, the same by which our religion and devotion to God is exercised, (as Vows, Invocation, &c.) or such as are proper to the Heathen worship, in the exercise of their

religion and devotion to their greater or leſſer deities, as adoration of their Images, whom they pretend to worſhip.

All this will farther appear by the next part of this Scripture, *and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

Him only ſhalt thou ſerve Mat. 4. 10.

XI. Of Latria or ſervice properly due to God.

Here he would faſten a miſtake upon us, by a miſunderſtanding of the word *Serve pa.* 28. why ſo! becauſe having *examined all the places of Scripture where this word* (λατρέυειν) which is here translated *ſerve*, he findes it *ſignifies that religious worſhip which is exhibited to God, never uſed for a religious ſervice done to a Creature as to a Creature, pa.* 31. Again that word is never uſed, *but for the ſerving either of the true or of a falſe God when it is referred to worſhip belonging to religion.* And he provokes any Proteſtant to prove the contrary, *pa.* 32. But how did he conceive we underſtood the *word*; when we affirm the ſame thing which to find out he beſtowed *as he ſaith* ſome days ſtudy by examining all the places of ſcripture; where the word λατρεύω is uſed, we ſay, it is very true that in all the ſcripture neither that word nor any other is ever uſed to expreſs *religious ſervice done to a creature, as to a creature* that is, as due to it. Again we affirm

tha

that this word, *when it is referred to worſhip belonging to Religion* is never uſed, but *for ſerving either the true, or a falſe God:* and therefore it is eaſily ſeen whether the Romaniſts be miſtaken in their Inference; *therefore there is another religious ſervice, which may be given to ſome Creature*: which is altogether inconſequent, unleſs they can ſhew ſome other word in Scripture, that imports ſuch a Religious ſervice: or whether the Proteſtants be miſtaken in their inference: *therefore there is no religious ſervice,* (or as he expreſſes it, no *worſhip belonging to Religion*) ſave what *is due to God.* So that, whereas he provokes any Proteſtant to ſhew that the word (λατρέυειν) imports any religious ſervice ſave Divine: the Proteſtant provokes him to ſhew any word in Scripture that ſignifies a religious worſhip or ſervice, ſave that which is divine or due to God: and therefore duly infers from ſcripture, that a religious worſhip or ſervice is due only to God. *No Roman Catholick teaches* (ſaith he) *that divine ſervice due to God only,* is *to be given to any Creature.* pa. 33. But ſeeing the ſcripture teaches no other religious worſhip, but what is given to God: you teaching there is another, teach beſides the book, broach your own

invention, and conſequently give to the Creature ſomething of that which is due to God. Whatever you reſerve for God, this is plain, your devoting your ſelves to ſuch or ſuch Saints, doth very much expreſs the notion of the word λατρεύειν, which is from λάτρις, a ſlave or manci-pated ſervant; and the frequency of your performing outward acts of religion and devotion to them, in *Pilgrimages*, *Vows*, *Oblations*, &c. ſpeaks a plain *ſerving* of them, and takes up (I fear) the greater part of your religious ſervice.

XII. Inſufficient excuſe of their worſhip.

Nor can this Author excuſe his *Roman Catholicks*, by ſaying this word alwayes implyes *the ſerving of the true, or a falſe god*, but their ſerving of Saint or Angel, is not ſuch a ſervice as is *given to God*, or *a falſe god*: for they do not think them to be Gods or ſerve them as Gods; and this I ſuppoſe was the Authors meaning and deſigne, in adding a *falſe god*, that he might ly ſafe, as he thought, under that covert. But this will not ſerve his turn, for if by a *falſe god*, he means, that they which worſhip, muſt think it to be God, or apply the worſhip and ſervice to it as to a God: then it is not true, that this word always ſignifies the *ſerving of a true, or falſe God*: but this is true, that the word, *when it is* (as he ſaid) *referred to*

worſhip

worſhip belonging to religion, alwayes ſignifies a ſervice due to God, whether given to him, or miſapplied to any other thing, although that thing be not held a God by him that worſhips, or the worſhip not given to it as to a God: for this obliquity of worſhip or religious ſervice; it is not neceſſary, that the thing worſhiped *be* thought to be a God*, is acknowledged by their own Authors: It is plain in ſcripture, the worſhip given the *Golden Calfe Exod.* 32. was *Latria* miſapplied, yet that not thought a God, nor given to it as to a God, but only as to a viſible repreſentation, to be uſed in the worſhip of the true God that brought them out of *Egypt*. Of which more below, in the queſtion of *Image-worſhip*. So the worſhip given to the *brazen Serpent*, was a miſapplied *Latria*, yet given to it not as to a God, but as to a holy thing, that had been inſtrument of ſuch ſaving operations. So the Apoſtle *Rom.* 1.25. ſpeaks of them, that *ſerved the Creature*, (the word is *Latria* there) *more then* (or beſides) *the Creator*: but together with him, yet not ſerving the Creature as God, but *reſerving ſomething more for God*, as S. *Ambroſe* notes their vain excuſe. And therefore the limitation which the *Trent* Council gives

* *Greg. de Val. in Tho. Diſp.* vi. *qu. punct.* 3. *de Idolatria.*

Ambr. in locum Quaſi aliquid plus ſit, quod Deo reſervetur.

gives here, that they *invocate and worſhip the Saints not as Gods*, (which the Author made uſe of *pa.* 3. and for that it ſeems added here *a falſe God*) is a poor and emptie excuſe; for the Heathen were not ſo groſs in their worſhip or the defence of it, but that they could plead this and other excuſes, which the Romaniſts make for their creature-worſhip, as we ſhall ſee * below.

* In Survey of antiquity cap. 1.

XIII. But he goes on in his bold aſſertions. *From this ground*, ſaith he, *proceeds the ordinary diſtinction of religious Worſhip into* Latria *and* Dulia. A diſtinction this that (as the Romaniſts uſe it) has neither *ground* in Scripture nor yet in St. *Auguſt.* who firſt uſed it, but to another purpoſe: as we ſhall ſee.

Impertinent diſtinction of *Latria* and *Dulia* in the Romiſh uſe.

Firſt for Scripture, as he ſaid of *Latria*, that *When it is referred to Worſhip belonging to religion, it ſignifies the ſerving of God, or ſome falſe God*, (which he makes the ground of this diſtinction) ſo we ſay of *Dulia*, when this word is referred to *worſhip belonging to religion*, or to religious worſhip it always imports *the ſervice of God*, that is due to God, and given to him or miſapplied to other things; and ſo this diſtinction has not ground in Scripture: the places are infinite, wherein this word as well as *Latria* is uſed in expreſſing

preſſing the ſervice and worſhip of God, and of other falſe Gods: take one juſt parallel to this text of *Mat.* 4. and that is, 1 *Sam.* 7. 3. *ſerve him only* — where it is δουλεύσατε. So is this diſtinction againſt St. *Auguſtine's mind*, as appears by the ſeveral places where he uſes it. For he finding the word *ſerve* applied in Scripture to God and man, thought the firſt ſervice might be called *Latria*, and the other *Dulia*, not making it a diſtinction of religious worſhip or ſervice into ſeveral ſorts, but a ſevering of the *divine* from the *civil* by theſe words, putting nothing of religious ſervice in the *Dulia*, but placing it in the *Latria* as wholly due to God; and this he confirms often, as in oppoſition to their deſign in their *Dulia*, ſo to their whole endeavour of having religious ſervice or worſhip given to the creature, as we ſhall ſee by ſeveral places of that Father, cited below in the tryal of Antiquity. Laſtly, as we ſee this diſtinction has no ground in Scripture; as to the uſe of the words *Latria* and *Dulia*, both being uſed there indifferently to expreſs the religious ſervice given to God: ſo likewiſe as to the thing it ſelf intended by the Romaniſts, (*viz.* a ſort of religious worſhip due to the creature beſides that which is given to God) it is ſo far

* Contra Fauſt. l. 20. 21. de Civi. Dei l. 10. c. 1. Qu. in Geneſin. l. 1. de Trinit. c. 6.

from having ground in Scripture, that is against the strain and severity of Scripture, which is very strict in securing Gods worship; and it serves finely to evacuate the force of the Apostles argument, *Heb.* 1. 6. who proving the Deity of our Saviour by that of *Psal.* 97. 7. *all the Angels worship him*; might receive this answer, it is a religious worship of the inferiour rank, such as may be given to the most excellent creatures; and doubtless the *Arrians* would have made use of this distinction, had the Church of *Rome* then taught this doctrine: so that either the Apostle was mistaken in his argument, or the Church of Rome is in her distinction. And if we be mistaken in our argument from this Scripture, then were their *Gregory* the great mistaken, who against Image-worship urges the same text *because* saith he, *it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*

Greg. ep. l. 9. ep 9. *quis scriptum est dominum Deum adorabis, & soli servies.*

To conclude, *Peresius* a *Romish writer* moved with what the Scripture and *St. Aug.* saith against this *cultus servitutis* this *worship of service* given to the creature acknowledges (as * the Cardinal relates it, and checks him for it) *that he did not approve the name of* Dulia *to signifie the worship of Saints, for we are not servants of the Saints, but fellow-servants.* Re-

* Bel. de Beat. Sanctorum l. 1. c. 12.

Rev. 22. 8, 9. *See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant, worship God.*

XIIII. Of worship refused by the Angel and by St. Peter.

Here as elsewhere he needlesly multiplies mistakes, repeating what he had above of Angels receiving worship from *Lot*; and of men receiving worship, as *Elias* and *Elisha*, though *Peter* refused it from *Cornelius*, *Act.* 10. and affirms, the worship of *Elias* and *Elizæus* to be the *very same with the worship which by Roman Catholicks is given to Saints and Angels*, p. 35, 36. How all this comes short of the purpose, both *as to the worship* which the Church of *Rome* gives by many moe expressions, then prostration or bowing of the body, which is all the worship that his places of Scripture and instances concern; and also as to the term *religious*, which in his large sense comes not home to the question; I say how far all this falls short: was abundantly shewen above. Now for the Text *Revel.* 22. That which we gather from it against their Angel-worship, does not arise from the bare prohibition of worship, but rather from the reason of it, *for I am thy fellow servant*: and so from St. *Peters* reason, *for I am a man*, which shews some undue worship was given, yet not as to a God, but too much entrenching upon that which was due to God. The Romanists feign

feign two reasons of this prohibiting refusal of worship: first, * *that the Angels refused, after Christs coming in flesh, to be worshipped of men, for the reverence of the humanity of Christ:* But they did right in refusing it, then must the Romanists think they do ill in giving it to them; for we men are bound to have as great a reverence and respect to Christ as the Angels are, and note the *Cardinal* saith, not only that they *refused* the worship, but *forbad* it, *prohibuit*, saith he. Secondly, *because* John *took the Angel for Christ*: but we may ask, how did the Angel know what St. *John* thought? Besides, it was improbable that he took the Angel for our Saviour Christ, for this is the second time, that he thus worshipped: neither do we find that our Saviour in all the visions appeared to him after such a manner. But the falling down at the Angels feet, *shews* it was in St. *John* a transport of joy, for the revelation of such things as the Angel brought, and thereupon an expression of that (more then beseeming) reverence to the messenger: and it is evident the Angel conceived he gave some undue reverence, for which he admonishes him to give none, but what befits *a fellow servant*, which ought not to be a religious worship.

* Bel. *Post Christi adventum prohibuisse ob reverentiam humanitatis Christi, de* Beatit. Sanctor. cap. 14.

worſhip or ſervice entrenching upon any thing due to God: the very reaſon that St. *Auguſt.* gives to exclude all ſuch worſhip by the word *ſervice or ſervitude. We honour Angels* (ſaith he) *in charity, not ſervice*; and immediately before inſinuated, God is *communis Dominus*, our *common Lord*, Lord of Angels and men; that is, as the Angel ſaid, we are *fellow-ſervants*. So we need not contend ſo much, what the Angel thought, as look to what he ſaid; whether he thought St. *John* took him for our Saviour (which this Author ſtrives to make probable) is uncertain, but the reaſon the Angel gave is clear, and enough to exclude their Angel-worſhip.

* Aug. de vera religione cap. 55. *Honoramus Angelos charitate non ſervitute.*

So that which St. *Peter* refuſed, *Acts* 10. was not a *Divine worſhip*, and therefore refuſed; for this Author grants *pa.* 38. that *Cornelius* could not ſuppoſe him to be a God: nor was it a due bounded worſhip, and refuſed only out of *humility*, as he ſuppoſes here: for then he would not have given this reaſon, *I am a man.* The Proteſtants are not bound to ſay (as he thinks they muſt, *pa.* 37.) one of the two, either that *Cornelius* gave him divine worſhip as to a God, or that St. *Peter* refuſed it out of humility. For though the Proteſtants acknowledge there was humili- XV.

humility in this refusal, (for humility seen in refusing not only due, but und honour too) yet have they cause to s it is evident that *Cornelius* gave him so undue worship, exceeding his condition and entrenching upon something due *God*, and therefore St. *Peter* gives him reason of his refusing it, *for I am a m* as the Angel, *for I am thy fellow-serv*

Col. 2. 18. *Worshipping of Angels.*

XVI. How far the Romanists agree with those worshippers of Angels.

He will have us here mistaken, becau *this text speaks of a worshipping of Angel whereby they are made equal to Christ, that Christ is depending on them, whi Roman Catholicks* (saith he) *condemn injurious to Christ*, pa. 43. His reason because the Apostle adds *not holding t head*, by which it appears such a worshi ping of Angels is forbidden, *as destroy the belief of Christs being soveraign head the Church*, pa. 44. to which he subjoyn as a proof, the Testimonies of several Fa thers witnessing that *Simon Magus*, an other ancient Hereticks broached suc phansies of the Angels, *pa.* 48. That ther were ancient Hereticks, that held strang phansies about Angels is very true: bu that these worshippers of Angels wer such as held such a phansie of making them equal or superiour to Christ, ca

no

not be proved: that they were not such, appears rather; for the Apostle first tells us this was done in a pretence of *voluntary humility*; now what humility is there in going to God by any equal or superiour to his Son? therefore they went to God by Angels as inferiour mediatours: and they of the Church of *Rome* have a pretence not unlike, in their applying to God by the mediation of Saints and Angels. Secondly, the Apostle in this chapter speaks against those that joyned the observation of legal ordinances with the profession of Christ, and therefore it is very probable he condemns such worshippers of Angels, as did it upon that account, because the law was given by the *disposition of Angels*. * *Theodoret*, who is shufled in among the rest of the Fathers cited by this Author, speaks directly to this purpose, that these worshippers of Angels were such Christians as joyned the observation of the law with the Gospel, and therefore used them as mediatours, because the law was given by their ministry. The other Fathers cited by him speak of strange phansies of some Hereticks about Angels, but without such reference to this place of the Apostle, as *Theodoret* doth, who comments upon the Text, and cites the canon of the Synod of *Laodicea*,

* In *Coloss.* c. 2.

dicea, (a place not far from *Colos*) f bidding any *to pray to Angels*: *Oecu nius* also upon the text agrees with *Th doret* touching these Angel-worshipp and out of *Chrysostome* (for he borro it from him) shews the pretence th made of humility in this their going God by Angels, saying, * *It was m then belonged to us, to go to God by Chri* which excludes Mr. *Spencers* pretence bove that these were such as made Ang equal or superiour to Christ; when plain they in humility applyed to them of inferiour rank.

* Μεῖζον ἦν καθ' ἡμᾶς τὸ διὰ χειρῶν προσιέναι. Chryst. & Oecum. in locum.

XVII. As for his reason from the Apostles a ding, *not holding the head*; that pro not, that they placed the Angels in Chri stead, or *destroyed his soveraign headsh directly*, as the phansie of those Heretick he would have here to be meant, did; so he may be said not to hold the head, th holds it not in that manner he ought, o because this worshipping of Angels wa the way to let go the head; as in th Church of *Rome*, their worshipping o Angels and Saints, and their Image draws off the people much from Christ.

And albeit the Church of *Rome* does no retain the observation of the law, as thes did: and so has not the same cause o their worshipping Angels as they had yet

let the cauſe or motive be what it will, for the ſame deflexion from truth and duty has not alwayes the ſame motive) they of the *Church of Rome* have the ſame pretence of *humility* in their coming to God by the mediation of Angels, and do place the Angels where they ſhould not, *intruding into things they have not ſeen, and not holding the head* (the one mediatour between God and man) as they ought.

XVIII. * Θρησκεία Religion of Angels.

Again he will have us miſtaken, in rendring the word (Θρησκεία) *a worſhipping*, when it ſhould be tranſlated a *religion of Angels*, and thereupon declaims againſt Proteſtants, as having a deſign in it *pa.* 45. 46. But this is needleſs, for the word *religion* had been more advantageous to us, in as much as we yield a *worſhip* to creatures, but when *religion* is added to it, we mean it a worſhip due to God, as St. *Aug.* alſo ſaid above. Indeed if we look into the Church of *Rome*, and well conſider their exerciſes of devotion, how they are directed, how frequented, there will appear a very *religion* of Saints and Angels. And as in this point the Romaniſts are too like theſe half Chriſtians, whom the Apoſtle blames for their worſhip or religion of Angels; ſo will they appear not much unlike to the Heathen

Plato-

Platonicks, in their worſhip or religio
their *Dæmons* and *Hero's*, whom t
placed and worſhipped as celeſtial meſ
gers, and mediatours between men
the ſupream God. Of which below
the conſent of Antiquity.

But to make up his number of miſtak
he muſt needs repeat here alſo *pa.*49.
worſhip was given to Angels by *Lot*
Joſhua, and that it may be call'd *relig*
by *Ja.* 1. 26, 27. not remembring h
much he is miſtaken, in giving us ſtill,
the worſhip we blame in them, exam
only of the worſhip we allow, the bow
of the body to Angels when they appe
ed: whereas we charge them with
worſhip, which the *Laodic.* Synod f
bad, which the Apoſtle here blames,
praying to them, and making them me
tors; nor will he remember how he is
ſtaken in telling us ſtill St. *James* call
work of mercy, *religion*, as if this w
any thing to the religious worſhip t
give to Saints and Angels; which is
exerciſe or performance of their *relig*
and devotion, as *religion* belongs to
firſt table in a ſtricter ſenſe; whereas t
work of mercy as all duties of the ſeco
table becauſe commanded, and proce
ing from *religion*, may in that gene
ſenſe be call'd *religious* works, not *reli*

worſhip. But indeed this *Romiſh* wor- cannot truly be call'd *religion* in the er ſenſe, or in any ſenſe: for it is not *manded,* it *proceeds not* from *religion,* dictated by that devotion and religi- we owe to God; it *pertains* not there- to *religion,* unleſs it be to the *Romiſh.* ll this more largely above.

CHAP. II.

Of Prayer and Invocation.

NOw we are come to a ſpecial act of worſhip given to Saints and Angels, places of Scripture here examined are, *me unto me,* Mat. 11. 28. *Ask the Fa- in my name,* Jo. 16. 21. *When ye pray, Our Father — One mediatour —* 1 m. 2. 5. *We have an advocate —* 1 Jo. . The Proteſtants inference *(therefore muſt come to God by no other Name, diatour, Advocate)* he will have in- ſequent: Indeed ſuch arguments from affirming of one to the denying all ers, are not for the moſt part conclu- g and valid, yet in the point of Gods rſhip they are of good force, if we allow I.

Aug. de consensu Evang. l. 1. *c.* 18.

allow the truth of the rule which S. faith, that *Socrates* allowed; *God is so worshiped as he has commanded himself to be worshiped.* So that it must be a presumption in man, when the Lord in so many places prescribed the way, add thereunto, by admitting and other *Mediators*, though inferior Christ.

A general Rule for worship.

II. The form of the Lords prayer.

What he saith to the *Lords Pr* comes to this: that Protestants by argument might prove, *We are on pray to God the Father* — and *th Christian living may not pray for an* pa. 57. But this is not alike, for we command and direction *to come and* unto the other persons of the Trin and also for one another living: An may call any of the Persons *Father*, fo the works of the Trinity *ad extra*, wards the Creature (as giving life being, nourishing and preserving, therly acts toward us) are as the *Sc* saith, *undivided*, common to all the sons: but because we can also call God Father our Father upon special rela by and through his only Son; there this forme implies we ought to come prayer to God the Father only by his m diation, by and in whom we can call h Father; and for his other part of re

one Christian living may not pray for her: who sees not the disparity between *praying for*, and *praying to, or invoking*, and that at such distance, as they Saints and Angels; but of this of the *ing to pray for one another*, more conveently * below.

* Nu. 6.

n the other places 1 *Tim.* 2. 5. 1 *Jo.* 2. III.

He will have the Protestant mistaken, excluding thereby all *Mediators* or *Advates of Intercession*: the Text speaking y of a *Mediator of Redemption*, beuse it follows in one place, *Who gave nself a ransom*—and in the other, *He he propitiation for our sins.* Secondly, t the Text speaks *of such a Mediator Advocate that deserves to be heard for own worth and merits*, pa. 69. That may better discover this usual but unounded evasion; Note First, others ides Christ may be said to *Intercede* us, as the blessed Saints no question: but that makes them not *Mediators Advocates* of Intercession; for they do without our Invocating of or application by prayer to them, out of that chaty and propension which all the members of Christ have to one another; also ey do it in general, in such desires as ake for the accomplishment of that boy, of which they are members. Out of

The office of Mediator and Advocate.

Intercession of Saints.

of which propensity we pray al
them, *i.e.* for their consummatio
glorious resurrection, &c. yet thi
ders us not their mediators. Sec
Note, that to state them in the con
of *Mediators* and *Advocates*: the
be enabled to receive our particu
quests and prayers, and so to p
them unto God: yea as the word
cate significantly implies they must
mitted in that Court to plead their
for whom they appear. This being
manifest that they are no way e
thereunto: it will easily be seen wh
the Protestants are mistaken, in excl
them from this office, or the Rom
in admitting them to it, without,
ther against scripture.

For this Author was wont in his
ted mistakes to shew the word or
in which he placed the mistake, o
wise taken, and applied to others i
pture: and its but reason, that he
will enlarge to others, what the scri
seems to restrain, should be boun
make it appear by scripture, and not
by limitations, and distinctions of his
invention; as it fares with all *Roma*
in this point and that of Image-wor
That which this Author makes the

nce of his distinction, or limiting to hrist only such a kind of *mediation* (viz. *redemption*) from the words following, z. *ransom* and *propitiation*, overthrows distinction, and shews the whole of- e belongs to Christ only: for it shews at his mediation of Intercession, or Ad- ocateship, and his fitness thereunto, is ounded on his bloodshed or ransom, or aking God thereby propitious; which e Apostle through the Epistle to the *He- ews* speaks most evidently: shewing r high priest is entred *to appear for us*, eb. 9. 24. *i. e.* to be our Advocate, or ediator of Intercession; and that he en- ed with blood.

This also shews the distinction is not ood, for one member of it is grounded pon the other; in the *Intercession* of our ediator and Advocate upon his redem- tion; for that tells us none can come nder one member of it, to interceed as n Advocate with God to whom the o- her belongs not too. So for his other xception or limitation, That *Christ is he only Mediator or Advocate, that can tercede by his own worth and merits*, omes to the same purpose, for he that an do so, must be a Redeemer too; It is great Truth: but that it should not ex- lude (as they pretend) the Saints and Angels

IV. Distinction of Mediator of Redemption and Intercession.

Angels from being Mediators in and
the merits of Christ, is only a saying
their own, without all proof or w
rant of scripture, and a bold saying in
For when scripture saith, there is
Mediator and tells us of no other; pu
us out our *Advocate*, and tells us of
other: directs us by whom, and in wh
name we must come to God, and sh
us no other, how can we without gr
presumption take upon us to appoin
thers, though in order to him that is
pointed? For our coming to or pray
to God, is a worship of God, an imm
diate serving of him, and therefore bi
us to go the way he prescribes, as
* *Nu.* 1. *rule* * above directs us, and *reason*
perswades it, for else there would be
thing fixed and certain in religion a
worship; For if in this point we may
vent new wayes and new distinctions t
have no ground in Gods word, then th
One God in the same verse would
obnoxious to mans conceit (in fram
other gods of lower rank) as that *one M*
diator is to this distinction of the *Rom*
nists.

V. Reasons against their Invocation. Again, Here especially in a point
Gods worship, that of the Apostle ta
place, *What is not of Faith is Sin*, Ro
14. *ult.* For how can it be of faith
com

ome unto God by Mediators, whom ey cannot believe to be appointed of od to ſtand between himſelf and us, or etween our Mediator Chriſt and us; hom they cannot believe to hear or now our requeſts and deſires: having no arrant from God to aſſure their people, at he will reveal or make known their eſires to the Saints they invocate. Furermore, it may be another reaſon aainſt this preſumption; becauſe it is od himſelf that prepares the heart to ay and inſpires it; what boldneſſe then it for any Creature as Mediator to preent our prayers? or, as the Apoſtle *Rom.* 8. 6. In our prayers according to Gods will the ſpirit makes interceſſion, therefore prayers to Saints, are not of the ſpirit, not according to Gods will, or elſe e ſpirit then maketh interceſſion by the ints. Laſtly it is a ſenſeleſs perverting the order God has ſet us: for our ayers (at leaſt mental) muſt as the Roniſts acknowledge, be known to the ints by revelation from God: ſo our ayers muſt firſt come to God, then by m to the Saints, ſo by them to Chriſt be preſented to God. The beſt account ich the * Cardinal can give us of their owing prayers made to them is s, Firſt he rejects wholly that way

Saints how ſaid to know mens prayers.

* *Bel. l. de Beat. Sanctor. c. 20.*

which ſome have conceited, that t
Saints *know prayers of the living by the r*
port of Angels. Of the two other waye
that *they know by ſeeing in God (as in*
glaſs) from the beginning of their beatitu
thoſe things that do any way belong to the
or *that they know by revelation from G*
when the prayers are made. Of the form
of theſe, he ſaith it is *probable*, then com
paring it with the latter, he ſaith it
more probable then it, yet the latter
more fit for convincing the Heretic
Where note, that their beſt way is b
probable, and the Hereticks muſt be co
vinced in this point, by that way whi
is leſs *then probable.* So uncertain is t
Article of their faith, ſo unlikely to co
vince Hereticks, however they perſwa
their people to it.

This Author ſaith nothing to th
knowing of prayers; he had indeed
reaſon to give himſelf the trouble of
ſputing that which their Church cann
agree on. Beſide all that has been ſaid
it, methinks reaſon ſhould tell them, ho
improbable it is, that a finite Creatu
ſhould admit and take care of ten tho
ſand ſuits put up to it at once; or that
ſhould be conſiſtent with the ſtate
bliſs, for thoſe glorified ſouls to be
ken up or avocated, by the care of earth
affai

affairs, yea, such as for the most part are of a dolorous nature. If God reveal unto them the conversion of a sinner, (as *Luk.* 15. 7. which sometimes is made an argument by them) its a matter of joy, and answerable to their general votes and intercession, for the accomplishing of the Church, and consistent with their state of bliss.

Now come we to the prayers of men living, one for another, often urged by this and other their Authors: who having no permission or appointment from Gods word, for making the Saints departed, their Mediators and Advocates in the Court of Heaven, seek pretence from this duty of the living. Therefore to a Protestant asking, *how dare they admit of any other Mediator or Advocate then Christ?* this Author rejoynds: *How dare Protestants permit their children to pray them, to pray to God for them? for what is this but to be Mediators and Advocates?* p. 61. And of Protestants usually commending themselves to the prayers of others: *This* (saith he) *is the very same intercession we put among the Saints and Angels.* pa. 62. Thus they are fain sometimes to mince it; But a great disparity here is between the desiring of the prayers of the living and their invocating of

VI. Prayers of men living for others, no argument for praying to Saints departed.

Saints or Angels: alſo between the pra
ers or interceding of men living for o
thers, and that Mediation or Advocat
ſhip they put upon Saints departed. Fir
We have warrant for the one and not fo
the other; we therefore *dare deſire* t
prayers of the living, becauſe we a
commanded to pray one for anothe
and diverſe reaſons there are for it, whi
hold not in the other caſe. The mutu
exerciſe of charity among thoſe that co
verſe together on earth, and much ne
Eph.4.3. that *bond* (as the Apoſtle calls it) to h
Col.3.14. them together; alſo, the benefit we
ceive by being made ſenſible of oth
Heb.c.13 3. wants and ſufferings: *we our ſelves be
alſo in the body*, as the Apoſtle tells
Laſtly, in this there is no peril of ſup
ſtition, as there muſt needs be in their
ligious addreſſes to the dead. Second
our praying others to pray for us, is
Invocation or a Religious worſhip,
theirs is to the Saints departed; they
cing a great part of their offices of Rel
on both publick and private in ſuch Im
cations. Thirdly, As the living w
they are deſired to pray for us, are ca
ble of this charitable duty, knowing
neceſſities, which Saints departed do
ſo their praying for us doth not m
them *Mediators* and *Advocates* for

that is, of a middle order between us and God Almighty, (as they make their Mediatours of interceſſion; but as *Compretatores* fellow-ſuiters, of the ſame rank, condition, and diſtance with us from God: in the mutual exerciſe of this charitable duty, they praying for us at our intreaty, and we for them at theirs.

VII. St. *Aug.* ſpeaks home to this purpoſe in two inſtances from Scripture: St. *Paul makes not himſelf a Mediator between God and the people, but intreats they ſhould pray one for the other* (ſo the living praying for one another are not therefore Mediatours; nay doing it, upon mutual entreaty and intimation, are therefore not mediatours) *If St.* Paul *ſhould be their Mediatour, it would not conſiſt with what he had ſaid*: there is one Mediatour, (which proves the former conſequence, that the mediation they give to Saints will not ſtand with that *one Mediatour*. His other inſtance is from St. *Johns, we have an advocate*, 1 Ep. c. 2. from which he infers the Apoſtle could not make himſelf a Mediatour: and ſo makes it conclude againſt *Parmenian*, who *placed the Biſhop a Mediator between God and the people*: we ſhall examine the *Cardinals* anſwer, by which he would ſhift this off, when we come to tryal of Antiquity. But

Aug. contra Epiſt. Parmen. l. 2. c. 8. Non ſe facit mediatorem inter Deum & populum, ſed rogat, pro ſe orent invicem, ſi Paulus mediator eſſet, non ei conſtaret ratio, qua dixerat, unus mediator.

VIII. This Author misreports St. *Aug.* wh he saith pa 63. *The Texts admit only Mediatour and advocate of redemption salvation: but more then one of praying Almighty God with us, and for us by of charity and society*, as St. *Aug.* sai citing, *contra Faust.* l. 22. 21. I suppo it should be l. 20. for in the place cited speaks of no such matter, but in the l. 21. where St. *Aug.* speaks of *our honour* them by way of *charity and society*, as *honour holy men living*, which this Auth misreports, as if said they *pray for* which is truth; but his adding *with* supposes they pray for us, when we pr upon knowledge of our particular nec sities and requests; which is false.

IX. **Their invocation destitute of Scripture-proof.**

He closes up this point with the pro of pretended Scripture: *If any desire have the Invocation of Saints and Ang proved by Scripture, he may please to ex mine*, Job 5. 1. Gen. 48. 16. 1 Sam. 28. Pitiful proofs; in the first, *Eliph* tells *Job*, if he take it thus impatient he cannot expect relief or comfort fro God or Angels, whose ministry in tho dayes was frequent; in the second plac *Jacob* prayes to God for his blessing up the lads, and wishes the ministry of An gels for them, as it had pleased God t use it, in blessing and delivering him

all his troubles; or we may say as *Athanasius* and other Fathers do, that the Angel there was Christ. In the third he produces *Saul* worshipping and invoking *Samuel*; which many wayes fails of proving Invocation of Saints, both in the *truth* of the thing and the *consequence*; Proofs these, fitting for such *Articles* of Faith.

CHAP. III.

Of Images.

THE Council of *Trent*, as we see by the Decree touching Images, would seem very careful that the people be taught, how they may safely conceive of, and worship Images: and that all superstition and filthy lucre be taken away in the use of them. This is easily said and pretended, but what boots it, when people are taught contrary to the commandment to bow down and worship: and to direct and secure them in it, do hear a company of distinctions, * they understand not? Whatever therefore becomes of the truth of that doctrine now to be examined, we may without *rash judgement*

I. Pretended care for the people.

* Vid. supra in *introduct.* ex Bel.

(which this Author layes to our charg
pa. 72.) challenge the Church of *Ro*
for so needlesly exposing her people
the peril of Idolatrie or superstition;
this and other points of worship.

The first Protestant position, sai
he, is; *That it is unlawful*
represent God the Father in
likeness: and the Scripture
Deut. 4. 15, 16.

II. Of picturing God the Father.

* Bel. de Imagin. l. 2. c. 8. *Docent imaginem Dei non rectè fieri.*

This Scripture he will have mistake
and misapplied to the Church of *Rom*
pa. 75. Before we ask his reason, no
here how they of the Church of *Rome* a
divided in this point * the *Cardinal* a
knowledges some of his Catholicks (*Ab*
lensis, *Durand*, *Peresius* and others) t
be of *Calvins* opinion herein, *that*
Image of God is not rightly and lawfull
made. And though these be the small
number in the Church of *Rome*, special
since the *Jesuites* arose and multiplied
yet are they in this more suitable to th
ancient Christians, who had no Images o
God, as *Minutius Fœlix*, and othe
ancient writers affirm.

Now see this Authors reason, why tha
Scripture is mistaken, and misapplied b
us. First, *because they of the Church*
Rome *do not represent God by any Imag*
directly, that is, *to signifie he is of a figur*
or

or shape like that Image, pa. 27. Nor did the understanding Heathens say, they did so represent their Gods by their Images. Again, *We represent God* (saith he) *only historically, as he appeared to the prophets* (*as* Dan. 7. *the ancient of dayes*) *neither is it forbidden to represent him, as he pleased to represent himself*, pa. 75. But we must put a difference between the representing of a *Vision* and of an *History*: to represent a vision in which God Almighty pleased to shew himself to the eye, is tolerable; but the Church of *Rome* takes greater liberty, (as appears by the decree set down by this Author, pa. 72.) of figuring * *histories*, and *passages of Scripture*, in which God did not shew himself to the eye under any kinde of figure, thus also in the story of our Saviours baptisme, they figure him like an old man looking out of the clouds, when as they *only heard a voice*, saw no shape: so in the story of Creation, they figure him like an old man with a globe in his hand; and without reference to history, they figure the Trinity, God the Father as an old man with the Son on one hand, & Holy Ghost in shape of a Dove on the other hand.

Difference in picturing of a *Vision* and *History*.

* *Historias & narrationes Sacræ Script. Conc. Trid. Sess. 24.*

His Hieroglyphical figuring of Gods attributes, as of *providence* by an *eye*, and

the figurative speeches of Scripture attributing *hand, wings, feet,* to God Almighty, I let pass as altogether unfit to make any argument for representing God by an Image; neither is he so confident of them as to make any concluding argument, but only some semblance for representations of God: for if he will make Images of these *Hieroglyphical* or *Emblematical* expressions, they will not prove innocent Images, which according to his own definition of an *Image* do represent the things as they are in themselves.

The second Protestant position (saith he) is, *That no Image ought to be worshipped.* The Scriptures are *Levit.* 26. 1. *Exod.* 20. 4, 5.

II. The pretended distinction of Idol and Image.

Here he makes (as they do all in this point) a great noise about the words and translations, to amuse the Reader in examining the thing it self, spending thirty pages upon the words, *Idol, graven image, likeness*: and quarrelling at our Translation as false and *partial*; *for* saith he, *no word in the first Text signifies Image*, and that *which we render graven image* (out of the Hebrew *Pesel*) *every where signifies an Idol, and so it is rendred by the Septuagint* in the *second Text* εἴδωλον Idolum; now *there is* a great difference between *Idol* and *Image*; for an

Image

Image is the representation of a true thing, but *Idol* a representation of what neither is, nor can be, as he who makes or uses it intends; thus he, in pa. 78, 79, 80, 81. But he should remember that in the first text the *Septuagint* hath it γλύπτον, and the Latine *sculptile*, and our Translation then does duly render it *graven-image*; also that εἴδωλον (by which the *Septuagint* in the second Text renders the same word *Pesel*) does generally imply Image, likeness, representation, although when taken with connotation of Idolatrous worship given it, it signifies an *Idol* in his sense; and seeing the Heathen false Gods were worshipped by Images and representing statues, he should not be so offended that we in rendring those texts put in the word *Image*; well, let the texts run as rendred in their latine Bible, our reasoning and argument against Image-worship will stand firm: it being but the simple truth which all antiquity for 600. years, according to Scripture asserted; and after *the Cardinal* (whom this Author follows) had laboured so much in his conceited difference between *Idol* and *Image*, he is forced to admit that which defaces it, as this Author, we shall see, is content to do, in acknowledging any Image may be made an Idol by the worship given it.

That

III. The prohibition of the Commandment.

That the prohibition of the command-ment concerned only Heathen Idols, w the device of the goodly second Coun of *Nice* after the year 700. which Coun to introduce or defend the Image-worsh then begun, so grosly abused both t words of Scripture, and the Testimoni of the ancient Fathers. They of t Church of *Rome* see themselves concern for the maintaining of their Image-wo ship, to defend that hold, and in order that, conceive it necessary to make su a distinction between *Idol* and *Image*, may seem to clear their Images and st tues from the prohibition of the Co mandment, and leave only that wh they call an Idol under it. Upon his lo descant upon the words, we may no 1. this their acception of the word *I* restrains it to the visible thing repres ing (and such was *Pesel* the *graven im ges*, *statues*, *pillars* forbidden in th texts.) whereas the things represented, the reputed Deities, *Baal*, *Jupiter*, *D ana*, were *Idols* too, and the main one and they that prayed or offer sacrifice to them, without sight or prese of their representations or graven Image were Idolaters by the first commandme And this note is necessary for distinctio of the first.* and second Commandmen

* *Vt infra*, Num. 12.

which

which they would confound. 2. Note, that he fixes the whole notion of his *Idol* in the false representation as we saw above; whereas the notion and reason of an *Idol*, if we will speak of it as Scripture intends and forbids it, stands chiefly in the worship unduly given to it, for that makes the representation forbidden; else if we set aside the consideration of undue worship, all *Chimæra's* and monstrous phansies of mans brain, expressed by the painter, would be Idols forbidden in the Commandment. 3. Whereas according to that restrained notion of an Idol (as he usually expresses it, to be *a representation made to represent any thing as God which is not so*) he would vindicate the Images of the blessed Saints from being made Idols, *because they represent them as they are*, pa. 83. This is a lame defence. For first, any representation made to worship the true God by, may be, nay is an Idol; such were *Labans* Images, *Gen.* 31. and *Micha's* Teraphin, *Jud.* 17. and such was the golden calfe, *Exod.* 32. and it is apparent that the *likeness* or representation forbidden, *Isa.* 40. 18, 19. refers to the true God; and so by *Deut.* 4. 15. that to make them an image or representation of the true God, was a *corrupting* of themselves; so by *Exod.* 20. 22. 23.

* Bell. de Imaginib. c. 24. *Idololatria est non solum cum adoratur idolum relicto Deo, sed etiam cum adoratur simul cum Deo, ut* Exod. 20. 22,23.

Ye shall not make with me Gods of silver the worshipping of the graven ima* *with God* is forbidden. Secondly, t*images* of the Saints, although *represe**ing them as they are*, yet become *idols* undue worship given them: this Auth is forced to acknowledge, pa. 81. and t*the same material representation may in**vers respects be an image and an idol*; *image being made an idol, by attributi**to it any thing proper to God*, pa. 82, 8 so then the distinction of *idol* and *ima* comes to this: first it is an *image* or r presentation, whether painted or grave then made an *idol* in the use of it, *Q**colit ille facit, he that worships makes t**idol*: so little does their distinction of *i* and *image* serve the turn.

True difference of Image and Idol.

IIII. The likeness of any — forbidden in the Commandment.

As for the word *Temounah* in *Exod.* 2 albeit in Scripture-use it signifies any kin of *likeness*, natural, artificial, or spiritu al, yet here he will have it of no large extent then the other word *Pesel* as he strained it to signifie an *idol* or represe tation of any thing as God, pa. 84. an concludes pa. 86. line 3. *No other repre**sentation, picture or likeness of any creatur**is here forbidden*, but *such as are intend**to represent them, by way of idolatry a**Gods and Deities, which they neither an**nor can be*; so he. But this is not de monstrated

monstrated (as he boasts) from the places of Scripture, which he brought for these words. For though it be true, that idols and the gross idols of the Heathen are forbidden, *Exod.* 20. and that in those places he brings, the words do import such idols; yet can it not be concluded from those instances, either that such idols only (i.e. the representations of false Gods, or of any taken for a God which is not, as he usually and cunningly renders the notion of an idol) are here forbidden; or that the word *Temounah*, *any likeness* of things in heaven or earth should be restrained to such idolatry; for who shall restrain a Cōmandment of God so generally expressed, without warrant from the same God, to tell us some *likeness* or images of things in Heaven or earth may be worshipped, so they be not counted for Gods, or worshipped as Gods? *Tertul.* gives a good caution to this purpose: *If thou observest the same God, thou hast his law, that thou adore nothing besides God: and if thou lookest at the precept that came after:* (touching the Ark) *imitate thou the prophet, and do not adore any images, unless God command thee.* Not that he commanded any where to adore images, but did command to make them, *viz.* the Cherubin —

Tertul de Idol. l. 5. *Situ eundem Deum observas*, &c.

This

V. The worship forbidden.

This slender evasion, that only such idols as he has described are here forbidden: will the better be seen through when we have looked upon the words following, *not bow down, nor worship*: for whether the representation be *pesel* graven image, or *Temounah*, the likeness of any thing, it is no idol till the using of it by *bowing down*, and *worshipping* of it or the like, do come. Here therefore he makes the like restraint of *worship* forbidden by the Commandment; it must, saith he, *proportionate to the thing the idols represented, a God*, and so *a Divine worship*, pa. 86. and then he heaps up places of Scripture, noting the grossest Heathen idolatry: esteeming the material picture, as a God, to hear prayers, to be able to help; and therefore they bowed down to it, prayed to it, and put hope in it: that it may appear how far the Church of *Rome* in her subtil and refined worships of creatures, is from the idolatry of the Heathen here forbidden. But I fear the gross sort of Papists fall down to the stocks and images, much like as those gross idolaters did to theirs; (some honest *Romish* writers have complaints to this purpose) and as for the understanding and learned Heathens, they were almost as subtil in their conceits and distinctions

the

heir worship, as the more knowing Pa-
ists are: as will appear below in the Tri-
of Antiquity.

But a great complaint he makes of our VI.
anslation rendering in the Command- Of our translating worship for serve.
ent, nor *worship* them, which should
e, nor *serve* them, by which word he
ill have a *Divine Worship* only forbid-
en: for the word *serve* shews an ho-
age done to those Idols, as to things ca-
able of such offices, and endued with
nowledge, power, and divinity; so he
. 88. 89. We answer, Though *service*
e more and may perform more (then
orship) to persons endowed with under-
anding, and power to give commands:
et in regard of inanimate statues, Ima-
es, and likenesses, *serving* them, stands
nly in acts of *worship*, and therefore the
ne may in that case be indifferently put
r the other: and both of them are put
s indifferent expressions of the same
hing *Deut.* 4. 19. *to worship them* and
rve them: so *Jos.* 23. 16. *serve* and *bow*
own as equal expressions: Only *serving*
ay imply a frequenting of those acts of
orship, in an order and way of Reli-
ion towards those objects of worship;
nd so the *Romish Worshiping* of Images
nd Saints may be call'd a *serving* of them.
And unless he will exempt those Heathens
(before

(before spoken of) from the *servi*
graven Images which they *worshiped*
may appear, that the importance of
word, *serve* them, does not infer
divine worship, or *homage* given to
as they esteem *endued with underst*
power, divinity, as he expressed it;
by this importance of the word *serve*,
Romanists think to secure their *wors*
of Images, because they do not giv
vine worship or homage to them,
esteem them endowed with underst
power, and divinity: then I say
more understanding Heathens ma
excused from *serving* of Images, be
they did not give Divine honour to
or esteem them so endued with, &c.
yet their *worshiping* was a *servi*
them. So we see there was no ne
such an outcry as he makes against
Translation, saying *worship*, whe
should have said *serve*; we had no ad
tage by the one, nor hath he by the o

VII. Other needless exceptions against our translation.

Besides this of *worship* for *serve*, he
sieth himself to finde three other mist
in our translating that one verse of
Commandment, which in his zea
Image-worship he brands with the
of fraud and double dealing. The on
translating *Pesel* a graven Image, w
should be *Idol*, as he would make us
lie

ve and all becauſe the *Septuagint* has it this place εἰδωλον, & the Latine *Idolum*; he will have us contrary to the *Hebrew*, *Greek* & *Latin* texts, ſo he *p.* 91. But what if ere the *Septuagint* rendred it εἰδωλον; in e parallel place *Levit.* 26. 1. it renders e ſame *Hebrew* word *Peſel* by γλύπτον, nd the Latin *Sculptile*, and who can deny hat this ſignifies a *graven Image?* and if eir Latine *Sculptile* be not contrary to e *Hebrew*, then we are ſafe enough. is ſecond exception is, that we tranſlate *any* graven Image. But his *Logick* ight teach him, that the force of *Indenites*, amounts to an *Univerſality*: that ſay there is not *a man in* the Church, is much as to ſay, there is not *any man in* he Church: ſo thou ſhalt not make to hy ſelf *a graven* Image, and, thou ſhalt ot make to thy ſelf *any graven* Image: Vher's the difference? beſides he acnowledges, that in our New Tranſlatin the word *any* is put in a different chaacter. His third exception is not much nlike the former: *To make the Text* (ſaith he) *ſound yet more againſt us in the ars of the Vulgar they make it ſay, nor the ikeneſs of any thing that is in heaven: when s it ſhould be, nor any likeneſs which is in Heaven*, pa. 92. But what Engliſh man would make any difference in theſe, more

then

then that the first is the rounder expr
on? and the zeal Mr. *Spencer* has for
Images of Saints (*which are in hea*
makes him so suspicious (if not uncha
ble in judging) we had a designe in
translation, *to make the unlearned t*
that the likeness of all things in hea
and consequently of our Saviour, and of
Saints, is here forbidden; so he pa
But the words *any thing* are here also
in a differing character to shew they
added for the rounder English expr
on; and as for the Religious or *Ro*
worshiping of the likeness or Image
our Saviour and Saints, we conclude
forbidden not by any consequence of
advantageous translation, but by
force and intent of the Commandme
Besides *Deut.* 4. 16. will bear pr
ing it out so in the Catechisme, for th
is *Col.* after *Temounah*, the *likeness*
any——

VIII. Of τῇ Βαὰλ Rom. 11.

After this in his zeal to Image-worsh
he spends 11. pages in noting places of
translations, where the word *Image*
he pretends) is *unduly* and *fraudulen*
put in; but because most of them we
so in the old Translation, and are co
rected in the New: I will only note tw
where the word stands still in our prese
Translation. The one is *Ro.* 11. 4. *to*

Ima

age of Baal. But how could τῇ Βάαλ better rendred? whether we supply it h εἰκόνι (as *Erasmus* did) which signi- *Image*, or with στήλῃ which signifies *tue* and may well be understood, it be- the word which the Septuagint useth hat History of *Baal* 1 Kings 10. 27.— * *Image* or *statue* of *Baal.* Mr. *Spen-* for fear the word *Image* should be re supplied, would make it refer to a *mal Deity.* But let him shew that any mal Deities, came under the name of *aals*, or *Baalim*; he acknowledges that 1 *Kings* 19. 18. (to which this place the *Romans* relates) it is, *that bowed not e knee* τῷ Βαάλ, therefore no femal ol is here meant: but because the lsely supposed Deity was acknowledged nd worshiped, by bowing the knee to s Image, S. *Paul* more expresly and egantly put it τῇ Βαάλ. The other is *Act.* 19. 35. where he quarrels at our ranslation for adding the word *Image*, n rendring the word Διοπετὲς, which gnifies *that which fell from Jupiter*: But eeing that which was supposed to fall was a statue or Image, what harme is here or fraud in adding the word Image, nd rendring it more clearly, *the Image hat fell—?* And what need this tender- ness in Mr. *Spencer* for the word Image,

* τῷ στήλῃ τῷ Βαάλ, *statuam Baal fic. Vul. Lat.*

if

if he would not shew himself *zealous* that, against which God Almighty has this Commandment declared himself *jealous* God.

IX. But its time from *Words* to return ag to the consideration of the *thing, worship of Images*; which he begins to do *pa.* 10 where he undertakes to shew that the ry Translations of the Protestants pro *nothing against the use of Images, prac sed in the Romish Church:* Certain much may be proved against what is p *ctised* there: but here we are to consi the *Doctrine:* see then how he ma good what he said. He supposes, t Protestant must take *Graven Image,* e ther in his sense above, for an Idol a false God, or in the sense he put upon t word Image, *i. e.* for a true represent tion of some holy person: the Church *Rome* detests *Graven Images* in the fi sense, and in the other sense a Grave Image is not forbidden. Thus he. But h should consider that Protestants can t him of Graven Images, which may a have been made to worship by them n a false god, but the true; and so forbi den in the Commandment: such we those we spoke of above, *Labans* Image *Mica's*, the Golden Calf: and note th those Images which were stoln from *La ban*

Of Graven Images.

, are called *strange Gods*, *Gen.* 35. 2. that the false Heathen gods were rshiped in them by *Laban* or any of *cobs* family, but because they used se in the worship of the true God, ich was to worship God after a *strange* nner, as the Heathens worshiped their ds; Again the Protestants can tell him *Graven Images*, which represent nei-er the true nor false God, yet falling der the prohibition by undue worship ven unto them; and such was the *bra-n Serpent*, and so their Images as used the *Romish* Church, may by undue wor-ip become prohibited.

But see his argument. If all kind of worship of Images were forbidden by the Commandment *Exod.* 20. then *David* contradicted Gods command in bidding them, *worship his footstool*, *Ps.* 99. 5. so he *pa.* 108. By better warrant may we say, the Church of *Rome* contradicts the Commandment of God: He saith, *Thou shalt not bow down and worship*: she saith, *bow down and worship*, and commends the practice as religious and profitable. But seing he alledges Scripture, to prove his position: let it be our turn now to shew his many mistakes, in urging that of *Psal.* 99. 5. for worshiping of Images. He begins with a complaint of our Transla-

X. Worship towards the Ark no proof for Image-worship.

tion,

tion, for rendring it *worship at his f*
stool, when it should be, *worship his f*
stool, the Ark and Cherubins upon
First, we might quit him with a more
complaint of their rendring *Heb.* 11.
Jacob worshiped the top of his staff, wh
the original ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον, will not be
But the Original in *Ps.* 99. will ad
ours, *at* or *towards* his *footstoole*, the sa
word and phrase being used in the
verse: *worship his holy Mount*; or *at* o
his holy Mount: *Pagnin* and *Monta*
rendring both places alike (to shew
indifferency of the phrase) *Incurvate S*
bello, and *incurvate Monti*: so that
Mr. *Spencers* argument, they were co
manded to worship the Mount as well
the Ark or Cherubins; and if the latter
capable of this sense, worship *at* or *in*
holy Mount (as the *Septuagint* turns
εἰς τὸ ὄρος) then may the former ph
be also rendred, worship *at* or *tow*
his foot stool; so the *Chalde Paraphr*
renders both alike, *Adorate in Do*
Sanctuarij, worship in or at the house
his Sanctuary that's his *footstool*, or pla
of presence on earth: and so the l
verse, *Adorate in Monte Sanctua*
worship in the Mount of his Sanctuary
the place where his Temple stood. No
as the same phrase in the last verse direc

he rendring of the fifth verse, *worship at his footstool*, so does reason also perswade ; for the people could not see the *Cherubins* which were in the holiest place, ow then commanded to worship them, nd that as Images and representations? ut the intent of the *Psalm* is to bid them equent that place of worship where his *ot-stool* was; and in worshipping to look hat way, not for the *Cherubins* sake, ut for Gods presence sake of which the rk was a signe and witness; so the Ark place where it stood did but *circumstantially* determine the worship, (*i. e.* that ay) it did not *objectively* receive the orship. Secondly, he will have (which so he repeats pa. 127. and 133.) images ommanded to be made and set in holy aces for worship, because these *Cherubins* were so; but how many mistakes and consequencies are here? *First*, in drawing warrant from Gods action to their intentions; *Secondly*, in supposing them e images or representations of Angels, hich being set out for worship, must cording to his own definition of an *age* represent the thing or person as ey are — but let him say, what individual Angels these did represent? Or what ngel is like, or did ever appear like to ose *Cherubins?* Therefore images ac-

The Cherubin there no proof for Image-worship.

cording to his own notion of *image* not here commanded. *Thirdly*, the tr is, those *Cherubs* were *symbolical* or *blematical* representations of the minis of Angels, which God as it pleaseth h useth in and about his Church: therefore is said to sit on the Cheru and to ride upon them: and this pair Cherubs over the Ark is call'd the *ch of the Cherubins*, 1 *Chro.* 28. 18. La his mistake iu supposing them set there worship, which is a *great* falshood, injurious to Almighty God that set t there, and I fear a wilful mistake; so cannot be ignorant how it is acknowl ed, that *the Jews did not worship A themselves*, much less their images; *the Jews had not those images of the Ch bins and* Brazen *Serpent*, *nor any im for worship*, this is asserted by several thers, acknowledged by some of Authors Society.

‖*Azor. par.* 1. *Instit. mor. l.* 9. *c.* 6 *qu.* 7. *Vasq. de Adorat. l.* 2. *disp.* 4.

He excuses (pa. 112.) their leaving these words; *thou shalt not make to th any graven image, nor the likeness,* in their shorter Catechisms; *Did we* he) *deliver the Commandments as P stants do, with the Preface*: The which God *spake* — *we were oblig put them word for word, or else the C mandments would not be answerable to*

XI. **Their maiming of the Commandment in their Catechisms.**

itle, pa. 114. But though you set not at *preface* before them, yet prefixing e *Title* of Gods Commandments, and etending to deliver in your Catechisms e ten Commandments, you are obliged deliver all the substantial parts or ings commanded or forbidden; otherse you make them unanswerable to the le, and to your pretence.

Upon this occasion he makes his defence their *division* of the Commandments, nich reckons but three in the first Table, crowding the second commandment o the first; and making seven Commndments in the second table, by breakg the last into two. The division of the ecalogue, if it were a point of great moent, might be cleared on the Protestants e, as more agreeable to the greater rt of Antiquity, and more rational in it f. For though * St. *August.* with some w others liked the former division, into ree and seven: conceiting three in the st table (which prescribes the worship God) suitable to the three persons in inity: yet *Romanists* have another and ore dangerous reason, because they see more suitable to their image-worship, make the first and second Commandent but one, and forbidding only an ol or false God, and to be rendred in

XII. The division of the Decalogue.

* Aug. *de decem chord. & qu.* 71. in Exod.

brief, *Thou shalt make to thy self no*
Therefore this Author, pa. 119. and
where he gives the summe of the C
mandment, would have the strange G
in our first Commandment, and the
ven image in our second, to be all
But if we consider the Heathen Deities
strange Gods were idols, and their
ing or sacrificing to them * without
image, was idolatry, according to
first Commandment; so also the
shipping of their images, yea, the
shipping of the true God by an image
another sort of idolatry by our sec
Commandment forbidding the *gra*
image. The worship also which
Turks give their *Mahomet* (I hope
Romanists will say) is forbidden by G
Law here: yet do they not worship
as a God, but at his Tomb, (and the
fore the thing forbidden must not be
strained to a false God as he would
it;) nor do they worship him by *any*
ven image, for they have no repres
tions or likenesses of things: therefo
is fit that our second commandm
which forbids such should stand di
from the first. And for the last c
mandment which they break into
and pretend a reason from the several
jects, *Goods* and *wife*: yet the unity

* *Ut supra*, Nu. 3.

ists upon the *desire* forbidden (in the word *covet*) let the object or thing coveted be what it will; therefore the Apostle renders the commandment by that one word, *non concupisces*, thou shalt not covet, *Rom.* 7. 7. And God himself has so disposed the words of this commandment, *Exod.* 20. that he has put the *not coveting of a neighbours wife* (which they make the ninth commandment) into the midst of their tenth commandment; putting before and after it the *not coveting of his goods*, which shews them but one commandment.

But enough of this. It is not the division of the Commandments that is so much to be stood upon, as the observing and keeping of them; did the *Romanists* hold this way of dividing the Decalogue, with the same simplicitie and uprightness that *St. Aug.* and some others with him did, we should not quarrel at it; but this we have cause to charge upon them, that in dividing they maim the Commandments, either by leaving out some material parts, as what concerns the *graven image*, *likeness*, *bowing down to it*, and *Gods jealousie* against it, or by restraining the sense of them, as we have heard.

XIII. The pretended respects upon which worship is given to Images.

Now he proceeds to give us the dou respect, under which they give reverc and worship to images, pa. 124. But i in vain to shew in what respect they gi if the Scripture exclude it. First he p tends it is but such a reverence as is giv to holy things dedicated or tending to worship of God: and in this resp (saith he) we give them no more h nour or worship then Protestants do Churches, pa. 129. This is too remiss comes short of their *worshipping* and *ving* of images. For we worship not ho things used in Gods service, but use the reverently with difference from comm things; also sometimes they determi our worship (we give to God) *circu stantially*, *ad hic & nunc*, for the perfor ing it *then* and *that way*: not *objectiv* receive it; but who can without sha make *images*, *holy things dedicated*, tending to Gods service, when there such caution in Scripture against that da ger? Or affix a special presence of Go to them? For this would be what th grosser sort of Heathens conceited of the images: yet does this Author alledge for the worship of their images, that reve rence which the ground had as made ho ly by the presence of God, *Exod.* 3. 9 where in token and acknowledgement of that

hat preſence, ſhoes were to be put off. The preſence of Patriarch, Prophet, or ſaint made not the ground or place holy where they ſtood themſelves: much leſs can the repreſentation of them in or by an image, render that image holy, and ſo require our reverence and worſhip.

His ſecond reſpect is, becauſe of their repreſenting the thing to which the worſhip is conveyed, pa. 125. and is not aſhamed to argue (but he learnt it from his Maſter the *Cardinal*) from the neceſſity of the inward image or repreſentation we have in our mind of the thing to be worſhipped, to prove the conveniency of an outward image to help our imagination—and *to help us to think of God*, pa. 126. That outward images and repreſentations may help our imagination in conceiving of the object, yea, and raiſe our affections, Philoſophy tells us: but in the act of worſhipping God, the danger of uſing images is great, leaſt they poſſeſs our mindes and carry away what belongs to the thing repreſented; as St. *Aug.* on *Pſalm* 113. ſhews how hard it is for him that prayes, beholding an image (ſuch is the manner in the Church of *Rome*) to keep his mind from thinking, the image heareth and helpeth him; where alſo he tells us that the Heathens who would XIV.

Use of Images.

* *Qui videntur sibi in gationis esse Religionis: dicunt, simulachrum non colo nec Dæmonium: sed per effigiem corporalem, ejus rei signum intueor quod colere debeo.* Augustin. in Psalm 113.

seem to be of *a more refined religion*, * ledged in excuse of their worship fr respects as these, of helping and fixing imagination, and conveying the worsh to the thing represented. We allow n only the *historical* use of images, but some sort the *affective* also: yet that o ly as to meditation and preparation; n for or in the exercise of prayer or wo ship: much less to be the *medium* or i strument of coveying the worship; her by images in the Church of *Rome* becom great stumbling blocks to the people th are not capable of the nice distinctio and limitations, which their learned on are fain to use in defence of this imag worship.

XV. Bowing at name of Jesus no pretence for Image-worship.

Again he seeks warrant for his ho images as things *that put us in mind of G* from our *bowing at the name of Jesus*: an is so courteous as to say; *What reverenc a Protestant would judge to be given to th name printed or ingraven: let him say th like* may be given to *any image of our Sa viour, and no more will be required*, so h pa. 128. But a Protestant may say; firs if he bow at the *name of Jesus*, he has Text will bear him out, *Phil.* 2. 10. which cannot be said of doing so to a image: Secondly, he may say, that th adoration done at the name of *Jesus* is our

ur holy offices, is given to Christ only as he *object*, but is *circumstantially* determined *ad nunc*, by or at the naming of m, that is, such worship is given to Christ at the hearing of that name, or hen he is named: and if upon sight of hat *name printed* or *engraven*, any man worship Christ, then is that name the *occasional* motive of his worship; now as or an image as it may not be the *object* of worship (in which point the *Romanists* do require more then a Protestant can yield) so it may be the *occasional* motive of worship, as should a man upon sight of a Crucifix worship the Lord Christ, lifting up his heart, putting off hat, and bowing; and in that we may say the image determines the worship *circumstantially* as to the *nunc*, the time (worship being given upon the sight of it) but should not determine it *ad hic*, to do it *towards the image*, for fear of making it any object of the worship, or *medium* in conveying the worship to the thing it representeth, and minded us of; and in all this there is no more of worship done to the *image*, then there would be to an *iron chain*, which he, that was bound with it in his captivity, looking upon, takes *occasion* to remember Gods mercy in his deliverance, and so worships God uncovering his head and bowing.

XVI. Kneeling at Communion no pretence for it.

Again, he seeks pretence for his h Image-worship, from our *kneeling* at t Communion: that if we say we affo any *reverence to the sacred signes*, it m *be religious, and then* (saith he) *Ih my intent*, pa. 130, 131. This seems to fairly spoken; but here's the cunnin to go very low in their doctrinal conc sions, but still hold up the practice, there they may easily exceed and exte it as occasion requires. But first, *re nence* speaks less then *adoration* or *worsh* far less then that adoration, which is lowed in the Church of *Rome* to images

Secondly, we do not make our *kneeli at the Communion* a signe or profession that reverence we have towards the *signes*: there being other reasons o But we express our reverence towa them, by handling them duly as comes such holy things, using them o in that holy administration: taking der with the remainder, that no un cent usage happen unto them; all wo ship and adoration that is performed the use of them, is given to God: not belongs any way to them but only *cumstantially*, in as much as it is do *towards them*; because that which th represent and convey unto us, is the gr motive of our worship and adorati

but thirdly, what boldnes is this, by the *reverence* due to the sacred sacramental signes instituted of God, to challenge like *reverence* to images invented by man, and not capable of that holy use? They have a kind of *relation* to the thing represented, such as arises from representation, which is the weakest relation: not such as arises from *dedication to holy use*, of which, as I said, images are not capable; being such things as God will not accept of, if dedicated to worship: and therefore not capable of that reverence which belongs to holy things piously dedicated by man: much less of that which holy things instituted by God may expect; and yet much less capable of that honour and adoration, which is allowed in the Church of *Rome*. And what if this Author saith, *he has his intent*, as satisfied with so slender a reverence to be given to his holy images? It behoves them to speak and write warily of such points in *English*: but which of their Latine controversie-writers would or could say, he had his intent, if no more were yielded then this Author pretends to be satisfied with? There being two *respects* upon which (as the *Romish* writers dispute it) worship is held due to images: either *propter se* for their own sakes, as a *reverence* is due to holy things, or *propter exemplar*,

Images not capable of the reverence due to holy things.

exemplar for the things sake which the
Bel. lib. de Imagin. c. represent: the *Cardinal* disputes hono
and worship is due to them in both re
pects, and so could *not have his intent*,
only a *reverence* were given to them, su
as is to holy things dedicated: though in
deed they are not capable of so much;
was said before; nor would *Azor*
(though disagreeing with the *Cardina*
have his intent: who casting off the fi
respect (as deserving little or no honou
holds only to the second. *The ima*
Azor part. 1. Instit. mo. l. 9. c. 6. qu. 5: *Dupli. ci honore non colitur Ima. g.* (saith he) *is not worshipped with a doubl*
but one single honour, and that for the e
emplars sake—— and that honour is the wo
ship of Latria, *if to the image of Christ*;
Hyperdulia, *if to the image of the bless*
Virgine; *and of* Dulia *if to the images*
the Saints. This is down-right, an
scarcely can be excused from idolatr
even in the opinion of the *Cardinal*, pa
Bel. l. de Imag. c. 24. sing his judgement upon that doctrin
which yields *Latriam* to the Image fo
the exemplars sake.

Instrumenta in usum administrandorum sacramentorum. Let us now hear what St. *Aug.* saith t
the Allegation (such as Mr. *Spencer* made
of things dedicated to holy use, *as abou*
the Sacrament. He shews a differenc
between them and images, as to this poin
of reverence. For albeit, (saith he)
they be *made of the same* mettal, and ar
wor

work of mens hands, as images are, yet by that ministry those vessels are consecrated, and call'd holy, in *his honour, to whom for our salvation we do service by them.* And it is not said of them as of images, they have eyes and see not, mouths and speak not — this he adds to shew the danger of images (by reason of their representation) when used in holy duties: for as he saith there, *the form of the image, like to one having life, much prevails upon the affections of silly men*; and more to this purpose this Father hath there; which see added below in trial of Antiquity, Chap. of *Images.*

— *quo ipso ministerio consecrata — in ejus honore, cui pro salute nostra inde servitur.*

— *Valet in affectibus miserorum,* &c. Aug. in Psalm 113.

One plea more he has, and it is fetched from, *Rev.* 13. 15, 16. which speaks of *worshipping the image of the beast*: whereupon he argues to this purpose. If worship of the image tend to his honour, that is represented by it, (as is evident by that place;) and it be lawful to do all that tends to the honour of our Saviour, then the worship of his image and so of all the Saints is lawful, pa. 133. As if he should reason thus; if the Devil or Antichrist or that accursed thing (as he calls it) will have, and takes it for an honour to have his image worshipped; then is it so with Christ or God; who saith notwithstanding *I am a jealous God* — And albeit the reverence

XVII. Image of the beast made an argument for Image-worship.

reverence done to the Emperours ima
tends to his honour, becauſe this is b
civil reſpect, of conveying which t
image is capable; yet is it far otherwi
in this religious worſhip; for there t
repreſentation of God or Chriſt or Sai
by images for worſhip, is like the ſtam
ing of the Kings image upon adultera
money without his leave: which is ſo f
from paſſing currant among his ſubjects
or that he takes it for his honour, that h
will command it, notwithſtanding hi
image on it, to be defaced and cut in pie
ces. Again it is too unreaſonable for him
either to *take image* in that place of *Rev.*
13. for ſuch a material repreſentation w
ſpeak of; or to draw the argument fro
that *image of the beaſt*, to ſuch materia
repreſentations; (much like the arge
ments their *Nicen* Council makes for wor
ſhipping theſe material images, from
what ſome Fathers had ſpoken of worſhip
ping Chriſt as the *image* of the Father:)
In that place of the *Revel.* is meant one
power, ſtate and government, which for
likeneſs may be call'd the *image* of the
former: and it is probable, that *image*
ſpeaks ſome ſtate among *Chriſtians*, that
ſhall imitate or be like the firſt beaſt or
Heathen Rome: and I know not wherein
one can be like the other, more then in

erecting

recting a new kind of Idolatry or image-worship, and in persecuting the gainsayers, that will not receive the *mark* or *worship the beast*. So that this Author and those of his communion may be concerned in this prophesie more then they are aware of; I am sure they can have no advantage from hence for their image-worship.

I will but adde this one thing; had this image-worship been used in *Irenæus* his dayes, and thought tending to Christs honour, then would those *Heretick*s he speaks of (who held our Saviour not to be the Son of the God of the Old Testament, that made the world and gave the Law) have had a fair plea: for how should they think him his Son, if allowing and taking it for honour, what was so cautioned against and abominated by God in the old Testament, and for which the Jews still do abominate Christian Religion, *viz.* the use of images in religious worship? It is a great piece of cunning in the Dragon or Devil, to induce men to believe, that this service of images, and creatures, so strictly forbidden by *Moses* Law, is authorized by the Gospel, allowed by Christ. XVIII.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of Justification by Works.

I. Merit of congruity.

HAving set down the *Trent* decree against Justification by works before grace, and against the merit of them: he challenges the 13. Article of our Church for charging the School-Authors with the *merit of congruity* in such works, which he denies any of them to have held, and is something passionate against the composers of the Articles, pa. 138. and 139. But what need such anger here? Seeing the Article determines the same truth, as to this doctrine, that the *Trent* decree doth; it might have so far pacified him as to allow that *parentheſis* in the Article (*as the School-Authors ſay*) such a candid interpretation as it is capable of; for it may refer to their *expreſſing* of the doctrine by that phraſe of their invention, (*deſerve grace of congruity*) not to their *holding* of that doctrine, for thus the words stand in the Article *neither do they* (works done before grace) *make men meet to receive grace, or* (*as the School-Authors ſay,*) *deſerve*

ve grace of congruity, do but for *say* ut in *expreſs or phraſe it*, and you have hat ſenſe plainly. But ſuppoſe the Arcle had directly ſaid *the School-Authors* eld that doctrine: will Mr. *Spencer* hazard his credit and call it a great untruth, and ſay none can be produced that held it?

It ſeems, He is acquainted only with *Thomiſts*; for though their *Angelical* Doctor did not approve it, yet their *Seraphical* (*Bonaventure*) does not account it ſuch an honour, no more does *Scotus*, and they were uot without their followers. Yea, ſince the Council of *Trent* the two * Commentators or Epitomizers of *Bonaventure* acknowledge it may be defended, and do anſwer the objections from the *Trent Decrees*. And as they ſay it may be defended and do defend it; ſo I think, to defend it is as little or leſs to Gods diſhonour, then their *merit of condignity* in works after grace: which beſides its own untruth, is attended in that Church by more corruptions both of Error and Practice, then the other is poſſibly capable of.

* *Trigoſius* and *Fr. Longus à Coriolano.*

Of the ſeven Particulars, which he draws out of the *Trent* Definitions *pa.* 142, 143. he ſhould have told us, which he oppoſes to Proteſtant doctrine, for not

II. State of the queſtion.

not any one of them can be framed in a just Controversie. Only he tells us *that in the last chiefly consists the Roman doctrine of Justification by works*, pa. 14. See then what that last particular is, and mark what this great noise they make of Justification by works comes to.

His last particular or collection out of the *Trent* decrees stands thus, *Being freely justified, we may do good works, and by them (accepted through Christs merits) become more and more just in the sight of God: Wherein chiefly consists the Roman doctrine of Justification by Works.* He might have added, wherein we yeild up the cause to the Protestants; for this the second Justification as they call it, and he knows unless he will grosly mistake, that when we say, justified by faith and not by works, we mean their first Justification, which indeed and properly is Justification, and from which they themselves exclude *works*, as the words above also do imply, *Being justified we may do good works:* they follow Justification. As for that which they make the second justification, and is thus described by the Council of *Trent*, *Being therefore thus justified, and made the friends of God* (there's the first or true and proper justification) *going on from virtue to virtue*

To fix it upon the second Justification, is to yeild the Cause.

they are renewed from day to day, and using those armes of justice to sanctification (you have Mr. *Spencers words*) *by the observance of the Commandments of God and the Church: their faith co-operating with their good works, they increase in the justice they have received, and are justified more and more*, as it is written, *he who is just let him be justified still*, *Revel.* 22. Now if this be their second Justification, and they intend no more by it then is here expressed in the *Trent decree*, viz. *renovation day by day, and yeilding up our members as weapons of righteousnes to sanctification, and increase in righteousnes.* We have no cause to quarrel at the thing, but only that they will call that *justification*, which indeed is *Sanctification.* But if under this their Justification they intend also a meriting of remission by good works, or a redeeming of sins (done after grace) by the merit of good works, (which neither the Council nor Mr. *Spencer* mentions, but their earnest contending for Justification by works, and some arguments their writers use for it too plainly shews they are concerned in it) I say if they intend so, and would speak it, we would think our selves more concerned in the cause. Now, as Mr. *Spencer* thought good to premise

premise seven collections he made out of their Council, the better (as he conceived) to shew, wherein the Roman doctrine of *Justification by works*, did consist: so I shall take leave before I come to examine his confused labour and impertinencies in the defence of that pretended doctrine, to set down some particulars, the better to shew, wherein the true Protestant doctrine of Justification by faith doth consist.

III. **Preparatory works to justification.**

1. Albeit *good works* do not justify, but follow Justification, yet are there many works, or workings of the soul required in and to justification; what the Council of *Trent* saith; *Can.* 9. pronouncing *Anathema*, to him that shall say, *a wicked man to be justified by faith alone, so that he mean, there is nothing else required, which may co-operate, to the obtaining of the grace of Justification, nor that it is necessary, he be prepared and disposed by the motion of his will.* It implies that which I said, and that such preparatory works are not excluded by every meaning of *Justification by faith alone*, for it condemns him that saith, *a wicked man to be justified by faith alone, so that he means*, there is none of these required.

II. These

II. These works or workings of the soul, are preparatory and dispositive to Justification, for there are many acts and motions of the will that go before, *desire, fear, love, sorrow, purposes,* (which may be call'd *Initials*) upon the ministry of the word, the *threatnings* and the *promises*: as before child-bearing many throws, so in the *travail of the soul*, for the second birth: *Faith* it self rises by degrees of persuasions (for there are divers acts and persuasions of faith) till it come to that last act, (that believing with *the Whole heart*) immediately requisite to Justification. Now faith in all those preparatory motions has the preeminence, for it gives beginning to them; for by the persuasions that faith has (of those *threats* and *promises* in the Gospel, and of all the truths of Christs performances and merits) arise *desires* and *fears, sorrow, love*, the motions of the heart or will, and these *Initials* advance, and gather strength, according to the advance that faith has in its apprehensions and perswasions; for this the *Trent* Council, acknowledges Faith to be the *beginning of mans salvation, the foundation and root of Justification.* Chap. 8. this is well said, in regard of faith's preeminence and efficacy in the preparatory works, had they but given

Preeminence of faith in them.

ven to it, its due in the act of Justifica-
on, that singular efficacy and proper
it has above all other graces in the appr
hending and receiving of the meritorio
cause of our Justification, Christ and h
righteousness. Now let not any thi
these preparatory acts or workings to b
without grace preventing: as if a man d
of himself and by the proper motion
his own will, dispose himself to justifica-
tion; the *Trent* Council condemns suc
doctrine, *Can.* 3.

III. Conditions and qualifications, in Justification.

III. There are other acts and work
also besides faith, which according to
their measure are required in Justificati-
on, as *conditions* of receiving remission o
sins; so *repentance*, and the act of *charit*
in forgiving others. But Faith here also
has the preeminence, no other act or
work of the soul having the capacity or
efficacy to apprehend the meritorious
cause: and so notwithstanding that other
workings of the soul, as those of Repen-
tance and Charity according to their mea-
sure, be required as *conditions* of recei-
ving the benefit, which is remission of
sins, or as *qualifications* of the subject
that receives it; yet not as *Instrument* of
receiving and apprehending the meritori-
ous cause of justification and remission, as
faith is: for which justification is specially
ascribed to Faith.

Preeminence of faith.

IIII. As

IIII. As for that infuſed inherent Righteouſneſs, which the Church of *Rome* lies ſo much upon in the point of our Juſtification, ſeeing it is the *Work* of God, as they acknowledge, it is no proof of their doctrine of *juſtification by works*: and they might forbear to make it the *formal cauſe of our* juſtification, when we acknowledge the preſence of it in and with juſtification, as a neceſſary qualification of the perſon Juſtified: A needleſs diſpute it is, *what ſhould be the formal cauſe* of our Juſtification, ſeeing the *meritorious cauſe* is acknowledged on both ſides. IV. Inherent Righteouſneſs.

But if they will talk of a *Formal cauſe* it can be no other then Chriſts righteouſneſs as imputed, and by faith apprehended, and made ours; for that phraſe of the Apoſtle, he is *made unto us righteouſneſs*, 1 Cor. 1. 30. and *we made the righteouſneſs of God in him*, ſounds ſomething to a *formal cauſe*, not inherent, but by way of imputation and account: not that God imputes his righteouſneſs as if we had done it, but that for his righteouſneſs performed for us, he not only forgives ſin to them that apprehend it duly by faith, but accounts of them, receives them as righteous. Therefore inſtead of asking after the *formal cauſe* in us, more Formal Cauſe.

proper

proper it is to enquire according to the Apostles expression (*Ro.* 4. 13. *it was counted to him for righteousnes* & v. 23. *shall be imputed to us.*) what is that which is imputed to us for righteousnes, upon which being performed on our part, God receives accounts of us righteous? We finde by the Apostle it is *our believing*, for it was so with *Abraham*. *He believed and it was imputed to him for righteousnes:* not the τὸ *Credere* the very act of believing, but more *concretely* considered with that which it apprehends, the receiving of what is offered in the promise, Christ and his righteousnes.

V. Lastly, as for those that are commonly call'd *good works*, which being done in the state of grace are more perfect then the former (such as were *preparatory*, and *dispositive* to justification, or according to their measure required to Justification, as *Conditional* to the remission of sins given in it.) Those *good works* I say, are the only works concerned in their doctrine of *Justification by works*, yet is not the first justification by these works, for they follow it; Our Adversaries when put to it, do grant it, and draw the whole dispute (as we see by this Author) to that which they call the *second Justification*,

Juſtification of which if they will make no more then (as I hinted above) their Council makes of it: we might here ſit down, having the cauſe yeilded up to us; but that they think themſelves concerned to propound the doctrine in groſs to the people, *Juſtified by Works*, and in their diſputes for it, to confound the firſt and ſecond Juſtification, uſing places of Scripture, which treat of the firſt, or true and proper Juſtification, as we ſhall ſee in examining of them.

This Author begins with S. *James*. 2. 24. which he brings as a confirmation of the *Romiſh Poſition*, that *Faith only does* not *Juſtify*: where it is our turn now to obſerve his miſtakes. Should we therefore demand, what juſtification is this that S. *James* treats of, firſt or ſecond? he muſt confeſs his impertinency: for the Apoſtle here treats of the firſt, the true and proper Juſtification, and that both he and his *Trent* Council acknowledge moſt free, and not by works; now this Author acknowledges it is the ſame Juſtification which S. *James* and S. *Paul* treats of, and its evident by S. *James* citing the ſame Scripture for his Juſtification v. 23. which S. *Paul* does Rom. 4. 3. *Abraham believed and it was imputed to him for righteouſneſs*; But it is plain that S. *Paul*

every where treats of the first and prop
Justification; The other example also th
S. *James* makes use of, (*viz.* of *Rahab*
plainly speaks the first Justification. A
therefore this Author spending his whol
discourse against that distinction of bei
Justified before God and before men; t
prove that S. *James* speaks of true inte
nal Justification before God, does h
prove what we allow, and what makes
gainst himself, who must acknowledg
man is truly justified before God befo
he does such works.

Seeing then this is the first Justificati
which S. *James* intends, and that as bo
they and we say, is not by works: th
cannot without gross mistake and impe
tinency be objected (as it is by them)
gainst us; but they and we are both
us concerned to reconcile the seemi
contrariety between the two Apostl
As for the distinction of Justification
fore God, and *before men* (albeit the
may be a several consideration of Justi
cation to that purpose, and good wor
do declare a man Justified, and (as I m
say) do justify his faith, yet) we need n
here make use of it; but the purp
of S. *Iames* in writiug this Epistle d
direct us rather to a several considera
of Faith or believing: for when he

nies a man *to be justified by faith alone*: he speaks not of a lively working faith, (to which S. *Paul* attributes justification) but of a bare and seeming faith, in profession only, and (as to good works) dead and barren, such as they rested in against whom he writes. This is plain by S. *James* his subjoyning v. 23. *and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith* Abraham *believed* &c. how could the Apostle bring this Scripture (the same that S. *Paul* does for justifying faith *Rom.* 4. 3.) in confirmation of what he saith of works, but to shew, that *Abrahams* faith which justified him, was a working faith?

VI. Romanists confound their First and Second Justification.

Now if the *Romanists* conceive themselves less concerned (for fear of the former truth) to labour in the clearing of the contrariety which seems to be between the Apostles; and think it more popular, and for their advantage, to cry up S. *James* his bare words of *justification by works*: we cannot help it; but must only note their wilfull mistake and impertinency, in so eagerly urging S. *James*, who speaks of the first justification. Mr. *Spencer* indeed promises *pa.* 148. to reconcile the two Apostles: but does it so, as neither of them will be reconciled to his second justification; as we shall see by examining the places of S. *Paul*,

which he insists on, to shew the Protestants mistaken: but first take notice of what he saith here upon occasion of the former Text of S. *Iames*. *Justified by good works, working with faith, and perfecting it, informing and vivificating it, as S.* James *describes them here*, p. 148. This is not only impertinent but guilty of falshood, belying the Apostle; for first he said not, that *works wrought with faith but that his faith wrought with his works* Secondly, Albeit the Apostle saith, *by works was faith made perfect*, yet does he not therefore *describe* works as *informing* and *vivificating it*; for here is no other perfection meant, then what the effect brings to the Agent, fruit to the tree, operation to the power or virtue from which it is; as every thing that is made for use, or ordained to practice and operation, is then said to be made perfect and consummate when it comes to working; but this is far from *informing* or *vivificating* it; he may as well say *the breath* which proceeds from the life of the body (its S. *Iames* his similitude v. 26.) does inform and vivificate it; In like manner good works do not inform, or give life to faith, but receive from it: proceeding from it as effects, and fruits: the whole chapter *Heb.* 11. shews it, speaking the effects of faith

ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ Ja. 2. 22.

even

even of *Abrahams* here mentioned. And that which this Author *pa.* 143. gathers from his *Trent* Council, ſpeaks plainly (as we noted above) that men *are freely juſtified*, and then do good works: And this ſhews *his impertinency*, for they require (fidem formatam) *faith informed*, for the firſt juſtification, how then by works that follow? and his inadvertency in again croſſing their own doctrine, for they ſay, *Faith is informed by charity infuſed in the firſt juſtification*: how then by works that come after?

Now for the Places out of S. *Paul*, which he inſiſts on to ſhew the Proteſtants miſtaken. The firſt is,

Rom. 3. 28. *Without the works of the Law.*

Here, and in all ſuch places which exclude the *works of the Law*: he will have Proteſtants miſtaken in the undeſtanding of *the works of the Law*: Becauſe by the Law is underſtood, *that which is written in the books of* Moſes *both Moral and Ceremonial*, and by works of the Law, Saint *Paul underſtands ſuch works as are done by force and knowledge of the Law, before the faith of Chriſt is infuſed into the ſoul, or that it is enlightned, and aſſiſted by his*

grace, pa. 149, &c. It is true that *the La* is often so taken: but when the Apost excluds *works of the Law* in relation t *Abrahams* justification, it cannot refer t *Moses* Law after given and written. But th speech *by faith and not by works*, comes t this issue: no man can be justified by do ing or working according to the Law he is under: Not *Abraham* by the works o the Law then; Not Jews by the works of the Law then, the Law of *Moses*: No Christians by works, or by doing what they are bound to do, by the Law and Commandements which they are un der; But by reason of their many failings in those *works* and *doings*, they must stand *by faith* apprehending Christs obe dience and satisfaction, to bear them out against the sentence of the Law, or God judgment.

And it is true also, that the Apostle sometimes takes the *works of the Law* for such as are *done by force and knowledge of the Law, before the faith of Christ*, &c. as when he speaks of such as sought righte ousnes by the works of the Law without Christ; but we cannot think the Apo stle excludes works of the Law, *i. e.* such as are done before grace (as this Author saith) from justifying, to admit works done in grace into their stead for justifi cation:

cation: nor think, that as Phariſees ſought it by the former works and miſt of it, *Rom.* 9. 31. ſo the Romaniſts may ſeek it by the latter ſort of works, and finde it; for *Rom.* 10. 3, 4, 5, 6, 9. he ſets the righteouſneſs of the Law and of faith ſimply one againſt the other: neither can *the righteouſneſs of faith* be imagined to be *any righteouſneſs of our working.* Obſerve farther what this Author ſaith *pa.* 150. that *Rom.* 3. *v.* 20. is added *By the law is the knowledge of ſin,* which is a reaſon wherefore ſuch works as are done by the knowledge of the Law only, cannot juſtify; from whence we likewiſe infer; If by the Law is the knowledge of ſin, and the Law ſtill convinces thoſe that are under grace, of ſin: they cannot be juſtified by their works before God: *David* and holy men in his time had the ſame way of juſtification as we (notwithſtanding they were under *Moſes* Law) who when they were juſtified and in grace, were concerned to acknowledge. *If God would be extreme to mark what is done amiſs, who could abide it, or ſtand?* Pſal. 130. and to pray, *Enter not into judgment with thy ſervant, for in thy ſight ſhall no man living be juſtified:* Pſal. 143. 2. that is, if thou in ſtrict judgment wilt examine what he does. The latter part of the

verse is sometimes thus repeated by the Apostle, *No flesh can be justified*, Rom. 3. 20. Gal. 2. v. 16. which word *flesh* Mr. *Spencer*, vainly takes hold on as implying one not yet spiritual but carnal, under the guilt of sin and corruption of nature: So *pa.* 158. But *David* speaks it in relation to himself: *No man can be justified*, not *thy servant*, by his own doings. So that still upon the same reason no man under the Gospel can be justified in the sight of God, by what he does: because the Law convinces him of sin, (and to the same purpose it is said, *We make God a Liar if we say we have not sin*, 1 *Jo.* 1. 10.) So that if God enter with him into judgment he cannot be justified, if the Lord mark what is done amiss he cannot abide it.

What he saith to *Gal.* 2. 16. as to the works of the Law, is the same he said above to *Rom.* 3. 28. and needs no farther reply. But that which is the main exception, and will ease us of farther trouble in this controversie, is his limiting of the word *Justify* in those and the other places of S. *Paul*'s Epistles acknowledging they speak every where of the first justification, which is not by works. So then the *Protestant position* (as he calls it) of *justification by faith only*, stands good as they

they intend it: *by faith only*, i. e. *not by works*, and this alſo ſhews their exception againſt the word *only*, is needleſs and therefore the *miſtake* he faſtens on us *pa.* 148. groundleſs; the word *only* being but excluſive to *works*, which he and his Council exclude from the firſt juſtification.

VIII. Sanctification, and increaſe of grace, and righteouſneſs.

Now for his Second Juſtification to which he retires from the force of all that S. *Paul* ſaith of juſtification: it is not worth our contending about, as to proper ſpeech, which controverſies require; for we acknowledge all that he or his Council ſpeaks of this ſecond juſtification, to be done in ſanctification, and to be properly ſo called, *viz.* the *renovation* and *increaſe* of that grace and ſanctification received: and that ſuch *increaſe* is made by works or acting: Philoſophy teaches, it is ſo in ordinary habits, much more in theſe which have alſo the influence, and aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit for their increaſe. But if he would have ſaid any thing to purpoſe, whereby this *Increaſe* of righteouſneſs by works, ſhould ſeem to deſerve to bear any ſenſe of juſtification: he ſhould have reſolved us (as I noted above) whether a man in grace may by good works merit the remiſſion of his ſin into which he is fall'n, as *David*,

and as he granted *pa.* 142. that *the first justification could not be merited by works*, so he should have told us plainly, whether remission and restauration of a justified person after his fall (which may be called in some sort a *second justification*) can by any works of that person be merited? They sometimes pretend to this when they urge *Daniels* saying to *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Redeem* (break off) *thy sins by righteousness*— c. 4. 27. Where let the Translation go as they would have it by the word *redeem*: yet must they confess this remission of sins to *Nebuchadnezzar* would have been the first justification, and not to be acquired by works; in like manner they must acknowledge their impertinency, when by *Luc.* 7. 47. *for she loved much*, they endeavour to prove, that her love was the cause of her forgiveness, when this was her first justification: But thus do they confound their first and second justification, in their proofs of justification by works, and being pressed by argument, they retire for answer to their second Justification.

That which they cite out of *Revel.* 22. *justificetur adhuc*, let *him be justified still*, is all the pretence they have for this second justification: where we accord with them,

them that by the *juſtificetur* is meant a progreſs and increaſe of righteouſneſs, but its their miſtake to make this (which is ſanctification) to be juſtification which ſtands in remiſſion of ſins. That part of the *Trent* decree which pretends to this juſtification by the increaſe of righteouſneſs, ſaith — *by yeilding up* (our members) *weapons of righteouſneſs unto ſanctification*, and thereby confeſſeth it is ſanctification rather then juſtification.

Exhibendo arma juſtitiæ in Sanctiſt. cationem cap. 10 de juſtific.

And therefore it is to little purpoſe, that he ſaith pa. 154. *If Proteſtants would conclude any thing againſt us, they muſt produce a Text which ſaith, good works of ſuch as are juſtified already, done by virtue of the grace of Chriſt do not juſtify, that is augment and increaſe*, that righteouſneſs already received, and make *us more juſt*: for we muſt tell them this is ſanctification, and no text of Scripture uſes the word *juſtify* in that ſenſe, unleſs that place of *Revel. c.* 22. be ſo tranſlated: and we need not fear it ſhould be, ſeeing the word there is to ſignify no more then a continuance in the ſtate of juſtification, or an increaſe of righteouſneſs, which we grant to good works, yea we grant them more, the increaſe of the *favour* of God: if they will put that alſo into their ſecond juſtifica-

justification, for the more good works a justified person doth, the more he is accepted of God; But such a person if he fall into sin (as *David* did) must come unto remission of sins, by the same way as he did in his first justification, *viz.* by *faith* and repentance. And albeit repentance has its works or workings, and charity also, in the first justification or remission of sins as *Iona* 3. *ult. God saw their works*, i. e. of repentance in turning from their evil way, and our Saviour saw the works of repentance and love in *Mary Magdalen*, *Luc.* 7. yet it is faith that properly justifies; because they are required (according to their measure) as conditions present, but it is *faith* from whose apprehensions the acts of repentance and charity do arise and take their advance; its *faith* which has a proper efficacy in laying hold upon, and bringing in its hand as it were, the meritorious cause for justification, and so that only and properly on our part said to justifie.

Justification by Faith

IX. Justifying Faith.

To conclude, that other mistake which he would fasten on us, in regard of the word *faith*, pa. 153. is needless; we must understand (saith he) a faith *vivificated*, *informed*, *animated* by charity and other Christian virtues joyned with it. The impro-

impropriety (I may ſay abſurdity) of his ſpeech, in ſaying faith *is informed and vivificated* by charity and other vertues, we noted * above, where he ſaid it was *vivificated by good works*, which was ſomewhat more abſurd: for charity receives life from faith, ariſing and advancing according to the apprehenſions that faith has of the goodneſs and mercy of God, and his ſeveral manifeſtations of it: and therefore S. *Paul* ſaith *it worketh by charity*, *Gal.* and note, that all his proof for this informing or vivificating of faith by charity, is S. *Iames* his ſaying, that *Abrahams faith was made perfect by works*; wherein (as I noted * above) appear both the falſhood of his interpretation, and the impertinency of his argument, for *works* belong to his ſecond juſtification, but that informing of faith by charity is ſuppoſed to be done in the firſt. A working faith it is that S. *Iames* requires, and ſo do we, to juſtification, a *believing with the whole heart*, as *Philip* required of the *Eunuch Acts* 8. 37. a faith that engages the whole heart in receiving Chriſt, not only for the benefits of his merits and participation of his righteouſneſs, but alſo for obedience to his command, and performance of every,

* *Nu.* 6.

* *Ibid.*

every Christian duty. Such was *Abraham's faith* or believing (to which his justification is ascribed) the acts of it were *pure* of faith: though *virtually* including work because a readiness to do works of every kinde, or obey any of Gods command. Lastly, Albeit such a faith justifies; gaining at present *remission* of sins past and giving a *right* to the heavenly inheritance, yet no man shall gain *final justification*, and absolution if he continue not in doing good works, *i. e.* his faith continue not to work, as *Abrahams* did. And this is that S. *James* intended by propounding *Abrahams* example for works, not denying his justification by faith, but urging it was such a faith or believing, that continued working, by suitable obedience to every command of God.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the Merit of good works.

THe Council of *Trent* has defined, *that good works do (verè mereri) truly merit increaſe of grace, and eternal life*, but neither the Council nor Mr. *Spencer*, tells us wherein the reaſon of *merit* ſtands, that we might know what it is they contend for, when they ſpeak of a work *truly meritorious*. Many fair acknowledgements their Council makes, as of the *free grace, mercy, promiſe of God, merits of Chriſt: Seſs.* 6. *c.* 16. which Mr. *Spencer* calls the *grounds* of merits pa. 162. But if they ſtand to this, we have the cauſe yeilded to us; and nothing left but a verbal controverſy: for thoſe former particulars are ſo far from being *grounds* of our *meriting truly and properly*, that they directly overthrow it. One would have thought that the *verè mereri our truly meriting*, ſhould imply all the conditions requiſite to merit truly and properly taken; and that the doctrine of *condignity*, or merit upon worth of the work, (which the men of Mr. *Spencers* ſociety generally

I. The notion and reaſon of *merit*.

generally contend for) ſhould be t
ſenſe of the Councils definition: b
that Council was wiſer then to ſpeak t
plain in this point, in which there is
great difference amongſt them, a
therefore may ſeem to content both p
ties: the one with this *verè mereri tru*
merit, and the other diſſenting par
with the former acknowledgments of *fr*
grace, *mercy*, *promiſe*, *Chriſts meri*
as grounds of merit; And Mr. *Spene*
may remember of what ſociety he is, a
how moſt of his Fellows ſpeak out, a
ſay, *The righteous merit eternal life b*
their good works, *even as the wicked d*
eternal death by their evil works; this
plain and home to a (*verè mereri*) *tru*
meriting: however he minces it at th
beginning, with profeſſions of free grace,
divine acceptation, and promiſe, as p
164, 165. Well notwithſtanding all th
fair profeſſions they make (when put to
it) ſuch indeed as overthrow *merit* truly
taken, yet will they hold the name and
thing of *mans meriting* eternal life;
and ſo propound it groſly to the peo-
ple. They know beſt how it concerns
them.

II. By reaſon of ſuch general conceſſions
Good works acceptable to God. of their Council, he will have ſome words in our 22. *Article*, to favour *merit of good works*:

works: becauſe it ſaith, *they are pleaſing and acceptable unto God in Chriſt.* From hence he infers. 1. Then are they no way ſinfull but *truly and abſolutely good and juſt, for no ſin can be pleaſing to God in Chriſt*, pa. 167. But this is too carleſsly ſpoken, for if abſolutely good (ſay we) then had there been no need to have added, *in Chriſt*: ſuch works would been pleaſing and acceptable of themſelves. We ſay alſo, good works are *truly good and juſt*, but not *abſolutely* ſo: they are not *ſins*, but ſomething ſinfull may ſtick to them in the performance: ſome imperfections, and defects, ſome mixture of by-reſpects and glances at ſelf-intereſt; yet becauſe they are good, both for ſubſtance, and for manner of performance, as to the chief reſpects, and motives, upon which they are done: they are *truly good*, though not *abſolutely*; for which the Article ſaith, *they cannot endure the ſeverity of Gods judgment*; Not that God accepts thoſe ſinfull imperfections or acreſcencies (as he would infer upon us) but pardoning and over-looking them in Chriſt, he accepts the good works. And what elſe is the cauſe that they acknowledge it ſo hard for a man to know he has merits, (upon which * *Bellar.* concludes it *moſt ſafe to put our whole confidence in Gods*

* *Tutiſſimum eſt, fiduciam totam in ſola Dei miſericordia reponere.* De juſtific. l. 5. c. 7.

Gods mercy only) what but defects and
perfections which are leſs percepti
when the works themſelves are notori
enough? 2. He infers, ſeeing ſuch go
works have the promiſes annexed
them, and ſhall be *rewarded* in Chri
they are truly meritorious in Chriſt, l
ving ſuch a ſupernatural goodneſs
them, *conformable* to that heavenly r
ward: and this is all which is taught
the Church of *Rome* in this point. So
pa. 168. This is the moſt he ſpeaks to
reaſon of merit, or why works are me
torious: viz. *Reward* and *Conformi*
but the firſt, Reward upon the free pr
miſe (as he affirms it to be) takes aw
more from the reaſon of merit, then
latter (which is *Conformity*) can adde u
to it: for that conformity (if our wor
or ſufferings be weighed or examin
with the weight of glory) falls ſhort
infinite degrees, 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. *Rom.* 8.
A conformity we grant between go
works and the reward, as between *gra*
and *glory*, the way or means and th
end; but it muſt be *equality* in wor
and value that makes merit; And th
Conformity or *Equality*, (were it to b
had) is but one of the things requiſite t
make truly meritorious; there are oth
conditions; as that the ſervice be of o
ow

The conformity of good works to the Reward.

wn, not his enabling us, of whom we re ſaid to merit, alſo that the ſervice be ot of antecedent duty to the Compact, ſo that the reward be (though by com-act, yet) not out of free promiſe and li-erality. Seeing then the matter ſtands lean otherwiſe between God and man, s appears by the former conceſſions of *ree grace* for the performance, of *free cceptation* of it unto reward, *of free and iberal promiſe* in appointing the reward: he ſervice or work cannot be *truly meri-orious.*

III. Againſt merit of condignity in goodworks.

And certainly theſe conſiderations did nd ſtill do cauſe diverſe in the Church of Rome, to decline this *truly meritorious*, t *merit of Condignity*, as we may gather y the * *Cardinal* acknowledging it of Tho. Waldens. And of *P. Brugens*, who would have them call'd *meritorious*, ot *ex condigno* of condignity, but *ex ratia Dei tantum*, only of the grace of God, which is the ancient notion of the word *meriting*, as it ſignifies the obtain-ng of the reward, through the grace and iberal promiſe of God; and ſpeaking of *Durand*, he ſaith, that the ſame argu-ments that fight againſt the Hereticks, ought againſt his judgment in this point; Alſo of *Scotus* and other Schoolmen, and of *Viega*, that they held good works meri-

* *Bel.* l. 5. *de juſtific.* c. 16. *ſect. quod attinet.*

Bel. *de Juſt.* l. 5. c. 17. *ſect. Alij contra.*

meritorious only *ratione pacti*, in re
of Gods compact and promise, not
one operis, for the worth of the wo
which falls in with the former: so
the *Cardinal* finds only this difference
tween the *Lutheran* doctrine, and the
They hold good works *verè bona &*
peccata, truly good and not sins, wh
the Lutherans did not: That we gr
them *truly good and not sins* was
above. But this satisfies not the *Ca*
nal, and therefore chap. 18. endeavo
to prove them *meritorious ex condi*
not only *ratione promissionis*, becaus
the promise assuring the reward, but
tione operis, because of the worth of
work it self: and fears not to affirm, th
God is made our Debtor, not only by vir
of his promise, but also by reason of
work. This I note, to shew, how
reason of *verè mereri*, truly to me
does force from the Cardinal, (w
strives to defend it) such affirmations,
from others (who did not see how me
could be properly between God and ma
such concessions and yeilding up of t
Cause. For this being agreed accordi
to former Concessions, First, What
required to make a work truly meritor
ous, and then what man receives of Go
free grace to enable him for workin

Non sola promissione, sed etiam ex opere nostro, Deus efficitur Debitor. Bel. *ibid* cap. 18.

d how man ſtands indebted to God, e controverſy is at an end; all their oofs fall ſhort, as not (*ad idem*) to the int: all our proofs from Scripture nd good, againſt merit properly ta-n, and the miſtakes Mr. *Spencer* would ften on us, appear frivolous, as we all now ſee.

The firſt place he ſets down, as alledged by us is.

Rom. 8. 18. *The ſufferings of this preſent time, are not worthy to be compared with the glory.*

IV. Goodworks produce eternal life but not, *ex condigno.*

Nothing here (ſaith he) *againſt merit.* Why ſo? becauſe, *as a grain of muſtard-ed, is not to be compared with the great ulk it bears, yet it produces it: ſo do ſuf-erings — the fair tree of life* — as Saint Paul 2 Cor. 4. 17. This flouriſh of a ſi-ilitude in transferring things *Phyſical* o *Moral*, neither proves nor anſwers ny thing Controverſal: Again, it comes ot home, ſpeaking only to the word *Compared*, whereas the force is in the (ὐκ ἄξια) *not worthy*, which in com-paring things *Moral*, as the work and he reward, is mainly conſiderable; ſo s here a great deal of difference between *Phyſical* or *Natural* productions, and *Moral.*

Moral. For we grant that the small *ſ* *ferings* of this life, may *produce* or *w* (as S. *Paul* ſaith there) in their way a meaſure, *a more exceeding and eter* *weight of glory*: but if this Author have it any thing to the reaſon of *me* he muſt affirm, that ſufferings and go works do produce it *veritate inſitâ*, their own virtue and worth, as that ſe doth the bulk (which comes of it) by own inbred vertue.

The next place is Luc. 17. 10. *Wh* *ye have done all—ſay, Unpro* *table ſervants, we have done th* *which was our duty.*

V. Unprofitable ſervants in reſpect of God.

The *miſtake here he imputes to u*, i *becauſe* we will have merit excluded here by this acknowledgment of doing but o *duty*, and being *unprofitable*. *Why th* (ſaith he) *deſerves a ſervant his wages, b* *doing his duty and nothing elſe?* pa. 16 Becauſe *duty* of a ſervant does not e clude merit or deſert, for the ſervant i not bound to that duty antecedently, o before his voluntary compact or Cove nant with his Maſter, as man ſtands bound to God. Neither does the Ma ſter ſupply the Servant with life, health ability: theſe the ſervant brings with him,

m, and therefore may be ſaid to merit deſerve his wages, though his ſervice as *duty* after covenant with his Maſter. is not ſo between God and Man. For e acknowledgment of being *Unprofitable ſervants*; *Who* (ſaith he) *can bring profit to God? hence is only proved that God is no way beholden to us, but we owe to him for all our good works*, (this is good Catholick doctrine, but contrary to what his Maſter the *Cardinal* ſaith, as * above cited, and directly overthrowing the *vere meretri*, the merit of works in any proper enſe, for if we *owe to him for all our good works*, as we do, becauſe he enables us to do them by his grace, how can we *merit* properly by thoſe works at his hands?) *therefore we are all to humble our ſelves before him*, and *to acknowledge that all our merits are his gifts*, and *the reward beſtowed on them, grounded on his free promiſe*, and *acceptation of them*, for the merits of Chriſt, ſo he *pa.* 169. This is good doctrine again, but ſtill contradictory to *merit*: for if his *gifts*, then not our *merits*; if reward upon *free promiſe*, and *divine acceptation*, then are not our works *truly meritorious* of ſuch reward. Nor will ſuch conceſſions which Truth and ſhame forces from you, ſalve the matter, whilſt your doctrine delivered

* *Num.* 2.

in

in Groſs, teaches to plead merit, and
place confidence in it; that is, to
proud of your own works, and to exc
it by ſaying, Thou O Lord haſt gi
me to be confident, and think thus w
of my doings; Thou O Chriſt haſt m
rited that I ſhould merit. That ſayi
Our Merits are his Gifts, though it
S. *Auguſtines*: yet as uſed by you, tog
ther with your other ſayings, do no mo
witneſs *you humble* in this point, then
Phariſee was, who ſaid, *God I tha
thee, &c.* yet all the while was proud a
conceited of what he had done, and
returned unjuſtified; nay he did not,
we can gather, adde the conceit of *me*
to his doings, and therefore more juſtifi
able then a *Romaniſt*, holding the doctri
of Works truly *meritorious*, and acco
dingly truſting in them.

The next place is, Rom. 6. 23. *Th
wages of ſin is death, but the gift o
God is eternal life.*

VI. **Life eternal the gift of God exclu. ding merit.**

Here he will have us miſtaken in the word *Wages*, and *gift* miſapplied by us: Why ſo? becauſe ὀψώνια which is rendred *Wages*, ſignifies the *baſe ſtipend* of common Souldiers, but χάρισμα which is rendred *gift*, ſignifies a *donative*, a more noble reward,

reward anciently given to them that had carried themselves more valiantly, thus pa. 171. thence he will have the *true meaning* of the Text to be, the *base recompense of sin is death*, but the high *and noble reward of God is life eternal*, pa. 172. But first, who taught him to render the *true meaning* of Scripture, by such significations of the word, as the Scripture does not own, for where can he finde in Scripture the word *Charisma* to signify such a *Donative*, but alwayes the *free gift* of God? his own Latine edition renders *gratia Dei*, the grace *i. e.* free favour or gift of God. Again, be it so, that the Apostle (whose purpose is to shew the different reward of sins service, and Gods) had some reflexion that way of *stipend* and *Donative* among Souldiers, it is but verbal, an using of like words, not affording any plea or answer in this point: when we speak of Gods gift or donative.

Charisma free gift.

For first, If Souldiers could pretend any merit for a donative, it was for some special service above duty; or of custom upon the succession of a new Prince: and then it was δῶρον, *a gift*, rather then, δόσιμα *a free gift*, such as that word in Scripture-use signifies, and such as Gods gifts and rewards to us are.

Secondly, Souldiers have not from the Emperour (that ſo rewards or gratifies them) the ſtrength, courage, and valour which he ſo rewards in them; but this Donative of Gods gift implies ſuch motions of grace (free grace, for the performance of the ſervice, free grace for the acceptation of the ſervice, free grace in the promiſe of the reward) as exclud all merit.

At length he begins to yeild to the true ſignification of the word χάρισμα, *we take the word* (ſaith he) *for a pure free gift, we may anſwer with S.* Auguſtine *and the Council of Trent, that becauſe the good works and merits themſelves are the free gifts of God: ſo alſo the glory of heaven, which is deſerved by them, is called truly a gift*; alſo becauſe *the primary title and right which all Gods children have to eternal life, is that of inheritance, which is the free gift of eternal life, may be properly called the gift of God.* 172. Thus does his anſwers and conceſſions which truth forces from him, overthrow the doctrine of merit properly taken. For if eternal life is called properly the gift of God, and our good works be the free gifts of God, then cannot they in any proper ſenſe be truly meritorious of eternal life. And becauſe he mentioned Saint *Auguſt.* take his ſenſe of this Text.

* *Whereas*

Whereas the Apoſtle might ſay, and ſay it truly, the wages of righteouſneſs is life eternal, he choſe rather to ſay, the gift of God is life eternal, that we might underſtand, how God brings us to eternal life, not for our merits, but for his mercies ſake.

* *Cum poſſit dicere recte dicere, ſtipendium juſtitiæ vita æterna, maluit dicere, gratis Dei vita æterna, ut intelligeremus, non pro meritis noſtris Deum nos ad vitam æternam, ſed pro ſua miſeratione perducere.* Aug. *de gratia & lib. Arbitrio cap.* 9.

Another place is Eph. 2. 8, 9. *Saved by Grace not by works, leaſt any ſhould boaſt.*

VII. The Grace of God excludeth merit properly taken.

He gives here the Anſwer we had above in the point of juſtification, That theſe *works* are ſuch as are done before Juſtification of Grace, diſtinguiſhed from the good works of the Regenerate, of whom it is ſaid v. 10. *Created to good works*: ſo he *p.*170. True they are to be diſtinguiſhed: but here the oppoſition ſtands between Works and Grace, not only in regard of Juſtification, but even to the laſt, *Salvation*, and with a denial of merit, which is here *boaſting*; ſo *Rom.* 4. 4. *to him that worketh*, &c. he directly ſhews that meriting by works (which challenges the *reward as of debt*,) is excluded by grace in the way of ſalvation; ſo that if any man will merit by works,

he must do them of himself: according to the condition of the Legal Covenant: but if he must come into the way of grace, to stand in need of a Redeemer, for forgiveness of sins past, for a supply of free grace for performance of good works for divine acceptation of his performances through the merits of that Redeemer, he is clean out of the road of meriting, or challenging the reward as debt, in any proper sense.

And therefore how vain are their pretty sayings for evasions, *That our merits are his gifts*; *That they merit through the merits of Christ*, or that Christ has merited that we should merit: and that good works are *meritorious through divine acceptation*: All which speaks contradiction or folly. For to say Christ has merited that we should merit, is to acknowledge we are indebted to God, for giving his Son to die for our sins, and for his purchasing or meriting the first grace for us; but then that we enabled thereby, should begin to make God and our Saviour indebted to us, in the reward of eternal life. Christ indeed has merited that we should not be bound to merit, that is, to obtain salvation by our merits, or performance of exact obedience by our selves, according to the Legal Covenant.

Again,

Again, he has merited that we might be under *grace*, and so perform good works, *created unto good works*. To say that Christ has merited that we should merit, or that God accepts our works as truly meritorious, is to alledge that for the merit of works, which excludes it: To obtain the reward by works, because they are done in Grace, or of grace, is sense; but to merit by works, because done in or by grace is folly and contradiction.

He proceeds to prove the *Catholick Position*, as he calls it. *That the works of the Regenerate are such, as can deserve Heaven*: where it is our turn again to observe his mistakes in the places of Scripture, which he brings to prove his *Catholick Position*. The argument from them is altogether inconsequent to prove *a deserving of heaven* in any proper sense of *merit*. VIII.

His places are, 2 *Tim.* 4. 7, 8. wherein he will have the words, *righteous* or *just judge*, and ἀποδώσει, give *or render*, and *a Crown of righteousness* to favour his plea for merit; as if by these expressions were implied, that God in justice rewards, that he *renders* or *restores*, so he will have the importance of it *p.* 173. as if due before: that the reward is a *Crown of justice*, so he will have it, that is, God is righteous in rewarding, yet works are not meritorious.

saith he a *true reward or price gotten by labour*— Which appears saith he, by 1 Cor. 9. 24. *our running for it*; and by 2 Cor. 4. 17. by *afflictions working for us an eternal glory*— whence he gathers, if they *work a Crown of glory, then are they a true cause* of it, *which cannot be but by merit*, pa. 173. then to shew they are worthy of eternal life, he cites *Revel.* 3. 4. *for they are worthy*: adding *Heb.* 6. 9. *for God is not unrighteous to forget your work*, which must imply the same as, *the righteous judge will render*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 8.

If he will stand strictly on these words according to the reason of true merit, he overthrows his former true concessions of *free grace*, *promise*, *acceptation*: which also gives us the true meaning of these *words* or *expressions*, not such as he would draw out of them. For the *free grace*, which he and his Council yeilds, is given us for performance of the work, that is, of *that fighting* and *running*, and then cannot merit truly, what follows on it in the way of reward: also that free and liberal *promise* of the reward, in performing of which God is *just and righteous* to render the reward, the *Crown of righteousness*, will not suffer good works either to challenge the reward of Gods justice as due to the worth of the work,

or

or to be *true causes* of eternal life by way of merit: they have their work and causality, in their way or measure: They are *not the cause of reigning, but the way of or to the kingdome*, saith a Father: Conditions of *obtaining the promise*, not *true Causes*, in the way of meriting it; we may adde, 1 *Jo.* 1. 9. where God is said, to *be just in forgiving our sins*, in regard of his *promise* of it to them that perform the condition of it, confessing their sins. Lastly, that *divine acceptation* which Mr. *Spencer* and his Council do yeild, is that by which they are accounted *Worthy*, *Rev.* 3. 4. And we may note, that when the Scripture saith, *not worthy*, as *Rom.* 8. v. 18. and in other places saith, *are worthy*; the Negative must be taken properly as to true value and worth; the affirmative must be understood in *some respect*, *are worthy* as to Gods account and gracious acceptation. Also note that the Scripture saith, *not worthy* of our doings or sufferings, to shew they are so if examined, compared with the reward; but saith, *Worthy* of the *Persons*, which argues its divine acceptation that makes them so, and then accepts their works also to the rewarding of them, though imperfect and unanswerable to it. See

Non causa regnandi sed via Regni.

How said to be worthy.

what this Author acknowledges pa. 17[illegible] *All their merits are his gifts* as *S. Augu[illegible]* ſaith, *and rewarded, through the fr[illegible] acceptation of them through the merits [illegible] Chriſt.*

IX. The beſt acknowledg un worthineſs.

To the *Proteſtant* argument of the Saints ever ready to acknowledge their *unworthineſs*, he anſwers, that by this cannot be underſtood, *that no juſt man hath any works truly good and pleaſing to God*, pa. 175. Neither do we underſtand or prove by *unworthineſs* that they have no good works, but *no merit* in proper ſenſe — So to *Pſ.* 130. 3. If *thou Lord wilt be extreme to mark what is done amiſs, who may abide it?* This proves not, ſaith he, *that no Saint has any good works or merits: for they do many things amiſs*, yet *through the grace of Chriſt may do ſomethings aright*, pa. 177. *Good works* and *merits* go for the ſame with this *Author*, which is his perpetual miſtake: and that which he grants, they *do ſome things amiſs, ſome things aright*, ſhews good works may be where no *merit* is, *i. e.* where many things are done amiſs: *Merit* cannot be where there is ſtill need of pardon, where there is ſtill need to beg, *Lord enter not into judgment with thy ſervant*, *Pſal.* 143. 2. that is, that God would

would not deal with him in extremity of judgment, or *as he deserves:* How then can any just person that needs divine acceptation for mercy and pardon of many things amiss in him, and again needs divine acceptation for his good works that they may be rewarded, notwithstanding they are accompanied with many things done amiss, and are in themselves imperfect, — how can such a person by his works be said *truly* or in any proper sense to *merit* the reward of eternal life? There is a saying of S. *Augustine*, *We should attribute too much to our selves in this flesh* (or time of this life) *if we did not live under Pardon to the very deposition of it*, or to the end of our life. So then to conclude, as S. *Augustine* said, *our merits are Gods gifts*, which excludes *merit à parte ante* in the original of our works, because done by Gods free grace or gift, so was it a saying of an ancient Father, *my merit is the mercy of God*: which excluds merit *à parte post*, in the end when our works are admitted to the reward, because that is done through Gods mercifull acceptation.

Multum nobis in hac carne tribueremus, si non usq; ad ejus depositionem sub venia viveremus.

CHAP. VI.

Purgatory.

I. The unreasonableness of Romish Purgatory.

OF the fower particulars which Mr. *Spencer* notes out of the *Trent* Council, three of them speak their own unreasonableness, and carry their condemnation in their forehead. 1. That just persons after they have (as they hold) merited *heaven* at Gods hand by their justice: and died acceptable to him, should go to a *Purgatory* to be tormented. 2. That the mercifull God, after the *Remission* of their sin, after he had forgiven them for the all-sufficient *satisfaction* of his Son, should exact of them such extreme satisfaction or punishment, and that only for some remainder of temporal pains, not satisfied or born in this life: when as that punishment exceedingly goes beyond all that can be suffered in this life though never so long. 3. That the Church of *Rome* forbidding all temporal gain to be made of this doctrine of *Purgatory*, should notwithstanding suffer it daily to be done, where the poor must be content

content with the general ſuffrages of the Church, but the Rich that dy (and can pay for it) have many particular Maſſes, Indulgences in order to their eaſe or delivery.

The places of Scripture here brought, in the ſenſe of which he will have us miſtaken, are ſuch as are intended for comfort againſt ſufferings in this life, and againſt diſſolution or death, by the bettering of their eſtate: but this doctrine makes all theſe miſerable comforts, and his anſwers miſerable (not only miſtakes, but) wreſtings of Scripture.

The firſt place is *Revel.* 14. *Bleſſed are the Dead, who dy in the Lord— that they may reſt from their labours, and their works follow them, or follow with them.*

II. The preſent bleſſedneſs of them, that dy in the Lord.

The text ſaith not, they reſt *preſently* after death; that's his firſt exception: and he pretends for it *Mat.* 5. 3. where the poor in ſpirit are called *Bleſſed*, and yet *in their miſery*: but bleſſed, *becauſe the kingdome of heaven belonged to them*, pa: 181. It is true, that *hope* in this life makes bleſſed: but the bleſſedneſs of the next life ſtands in *fruition*, according to the meaſures God has appointed:

ted: But the force of the Argument stands not on the Term *Blessed*, but the reason, their *dying in the Lord*, and *resting* from their Labours; for *dying* in the Lord, and *sleeping* in Christ are all one, and that *sleeping* does necessarily infer, that the *Rest* begins at death, as the *sleep* doth; and little comfort would it be, if they went not presently to *Rest*: for what joy is it to be taken from the Labours of this life, to go to worse? again, that which enforces this *presently* is their *works following them*, that they follow them for reward, he grants *pa.* 182. that they follow them not at a distance but *presently*, if the reason of giving the *reward* after *Labours* cease, do not evince it, the expression here may, for it is not ἀκολουθεῖ αὐτοῖς, *follow them*, which might be at some distance, but more then the translation expresses, it is ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῶν, *follow with them*, that is *immediately*: As *Rev.* 6. 8. *Death* is described sitting on a horse going out to destroy, and *Hades followed with him*, ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτῷ, that is, *immediately*, as *Hades*, or the invisible state to which the soul goes, follows immediately upon death. More to confirm this *presently* going to rest or some blessed condition after death, in the next place of Scripture. His second

exception

exception is like the talking of a man in his dream; that we miſtake the word *Labours*, which here is not taken ſaith he, for all labours, but the labours and perſecutions of this life; or that they ceaſe from their *good works*, pa. 182. But if the endeavours of *good works* were here meant by *labours*, then reaſon, and the comfort intended by this Text would infer, that thoſe labours being at an end, the ſervice performed, the reward ſhould immediately follow; the warfare and combate being ended, ſome Prize or Crown ſhould be received, and ſo indeed *their works following them*, or with them, does imply; but here inſtead of receiving reward, or reſt, the Combatant that has laboured, and conquered, is carried to the houſe of Correction, delivered up to certain torments. And take the *labours* here for ſufferings of this life as they muſt, and to the excluding of ſufferings and torments after; then is the *Romiſh Purgatory excluded*, which wholly perverts the intent and ſcope of the Scripture ſpoken for their comfort: and allows them no more in this Reſt, then the wicked have when they dy, a freedome from the labours of this life, leaving them only *hope* of coming out after ſome time.

The

The next place is, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. *For we know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, We have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven.*

III. The same again proved.

Here again he tels us, we are mistaken, *for the Words say not they go presently after death into that heavenly house*, pa. 183. But surely the Apostles argument here for comfort against the *dissolution* of this house, must imply a *present* entring into the other or into some part of it: also the word *uncloathing* (which is in death) must imply *a cloathing with that house*, v. 2. The Apostle desired to be *cloathed upon*, without *uncloathing*, (which shall be the condition of all just persons of the last age, that are taken alive at the last day;, no *Romish Purgatory* can be for them,) but if that *cloathing upon* were denied to them of the Apostles age as it was, so that it came to an *uncloathing*: the Apostle had said little to their comfort, in telling them of *their house from heaven*, if he had not implied, that upon their *uncloathing* they should be received into it; but that contrarily they should first go to a house below, and there suffer, in the next region to hell, exquisit torments for many

many years. Alſo the oppoſition he makes between, *at home in the body, & abſent from the Lord*, v. 6. and *abſent from the body and preſent with the Lord* v. 8. plainly ſhews the denial of the one, inferrs the other: if *abſent from the body*, then *preſent with the Lord*; and ſo the application which our Saviour makes of the wiſdome of the unjuſt Steward *Luc.* 16. 8. *that when ye fail*, (there is this *diſſolving*, or going out of the *body*) *they may receive you into everlaſting habitations*: ther's the *heavenly houſe*: a preſent reception is neceſſarily implied, even as the Steward meant to be provided of a place to receive him, as ſoon as he ſhould be turned out of his Lords houſe.

The next place is *Wiſd.* 3. 1. *The ſouls of the righteous are in the hands of God and no torment ſhall touch them.*

IV. Righteous ſouls after Death, free from Torment.

The word Torment here is miſunderſtood, ſaith he. Why ſo! becauſe it is in the Greek, Βάσανος, *a torment*, that *malefactors, or ſuſpected to be ſo, are put to, to make them confeſs the truth: Now no ſuch torment ſhall touch the righteous*, for God has ſufficiently *tried them, and proved them, and found them worthy of God*, v. 5. *which is a plain place for merits*, pa. 184. If he looſe one thing by this Text, he

he will catch at another. If it make gainſt Purgatory, he will have it make for merits. Well if it be ſo plain for merits, he muſt wring them out of the word *worthy*: which being * objected above in the point of *merits*, was anſwered too. But as for the word Βάσανος, which concerns Purgatory: let the original uſe or ſtrict importance of the word be it what it will: the Text excludes all pains by ſaying *no torment*, and what matters it, if they that go to Purgatory, ſuffer not the pain upon the like account of queſtion and examination as ſuſpected perſons; ſo that indeed they ſuffer the like, as Malefactors do? It would be mockery and not comfort, to tell them they ſhall ſuffer not under that name, but as much. And to ſuffer this, now that they are come from under the *hands* and violence of their enemies (againſt which this is their comfort) *into the hands of God*, (which the Text puts as the reaſon, why no torment can touch them,) and thus to be handled there? and that after God had *proved*, and *found them worthy of himſelf*, as this chapter v. 5. hath it; how can this ſtand with the goodneſs of God or the intent of this Text, which is ſpoken for their comfort?

* cap. 5. num. 8.

But

But he will demonstrate *Purgatory* to be expressed in Scripture as much as *Trinity*, ὁμοούσιον, *Consubstantial*, pa. 185. This is great boldness, whether we look at the comparison of the things, or the difficulty of the undertaking: but he learnt this from his Master the * *Cardinal* who was not ashamed to say it, and Mr. *Spencer* is not afraid to follow him, let him say and undertake what he will. His pretended Demonstration proceeds thus, *Purgatory is the place where temporal punishments are suffered by just persons after death, which they deserved in their life*, now *if any justified soul be liable to suffer such after death, then there is a place where they must suffer them.* To prove them liable to such punishments, he endeavours to shew, that *justified persons yet living after remission of their sins, and consequently of eternal Torment are liable to some temporal punishment*, pa. 185, 186. This proposition is too infirm to make a demonstration or proof of *Purgatory*: for we may ask if upon remission of sin *consequently* there be a remission of eternal, why not *consequently* of temporal punishment? he dare not say that temporal punishment is not remitted when sin is forgiven, and therefore saith, *liable to some temporal punishments*; and pa. 187. he

V. His Argument for Purgatory punishment

* *Bel. l. 1. de Purgat. c. 15.*

he saith, *God retains part of the punishment*, he means, to be satisfied or paid by us; which will be found true, or when it pleases God to reserve some, and inflict it, yet not as satisfactory punishment, but for other purposes, as we shall see. Again we may ask, though it be true that remission *of sin be consequently the remission of eternal punishment*, and that some living are after remission of their sin temporally afflicted with respect to that sin: yet how will this *consequently* fall upon just persons dead?

VI. To make good the proposition, *that just men living are liable to some temporal punishment*, he brings the example of *David* punished with the death of his child* and of *Adam* who *after his sin forgiven was notwithstanding liable to death*, as *just persons are for the same reason*, pa. 186. His alledging the example of *Adam's* sin punishmed by death—— is altogether impertinent to the question, and Mr. *Spencer* surely knew it well enough; for his question is not concerned in the punishments immediately upon Original sin, which cleaves universally to our nature, and from which no just persons whatsoever, though they have fully satisfied (as they suppose) for temporal punishments, are free; but the question is concerned only

* 2 *Sam.* 12. 13, 14.

Of punishment reserved and inflicted after forgiveness of sin.

only in the temporal punishment due to actual sins committed after baptisme; for to these only belongs the doctrine of satisfaction, as he knows their *Trent* Council has defined; for mortality and bodily infirmities following the natural state, are not matter for satisfactions, or indulgences to work on, as the *Romanists* will grant. Let us therefore examine his other example of *David* whether it will prove his Proposition. We say, just persons after the remission of their sins are not *liable to* temporal punishment *Ordinarie, ordinarily* and of course, that is, God does not alwayes reserve some temporal punishment or part of the temporal punishment due to their sin, and to be inflicted, or satisfied for by themselves; but does reserve such punishments to be inflicted, when and as he thinks fit. Again when he does reserve and inflict them it is not *in ordine justitiæ*, in order to his justice requiring punishment as satisfactory to it, which he must suppose when he saith, *if not suffered here, it must be else where*; But Almighty God inflicts such punishments for other reasons and purposes: as for *correction* and *amendment* of persons so suffering, or at least for *admonition* to others, as when the person suffering dyes, or is taken away

by

by the punishment; So that such punish-
ments after sin forgiven are not proper
satisfactory (as the Romanists must a
do suppose) but *Castigatory*, at least
monitory to others.

VII. Other reasons of punishment besides satisfaction.

We grant such punishments are inflict-
ed, and that with relation to and by oc-
casion of sin, as *Davids* was, not out o
vindicative justice requiring satisfaction
as they must suppose, but for other rea-
sons of Correction, or admonition, a
was said, and as appears by the reason
the Lord gives of *Davids* punishment
Howbeit (that is, notwithstanding th
thy sin is taken away, and the punishme
due unto it) *because thou hast by this de*
(or sin) *given great occasion to the en-*
mies of the lord to blaspheme—— which al
gives us another reason of Gods some
time punishing such persons, that he may
shew he does not approve sin in his chil-
dren, but that it is displeasing to him
as is said 2 *Sam.* 11. ult. *but the thing that*
David *had done, displeased the Lord*: Now
that God Almighty does not *ordinarily*
and alwayes reserve such punishment
after forgiveness: appears, 1. Because he
has no where declared, that such punish-
ments are reserved or do remain after
forgiveness, to be satisfied for by us: but
every where has declared, he is well sa-
tisfied

isfied with the *fruits of repentance:* that , if the person to whom he forgives sin, arefully avoids the like sin, and performs he contrary duties. 2. becaufe he has et out his forgiveneſs as perfect and full, pardoning of the whole debt, of which he temporal puniſhment due to ſin, is art; and in this point of forgiving he ould have us imitate him, *Be mercifull s he is merciful, Luc.* 3. Another rea- on of our denying ſatisfactory puniſh- ent inflicted after forgiveneſs of the ſin, s becauſe that forgiveneſs is imparted for he ſatisfaction of Chriſt, which was full nd all-ſufficient, payed by him for the hole debt or puniſhment due to ſin: or *he bore our griefs*, and *our chaſtiſement* (Iſa. 53. 4, 5.) even all that ſin made us iable to, whether eternal or temporal. And yet is the *Cardinal* ſo bold as by di- ſtinguiſhing of ſatisfaction for ſin, to give us part with and under Chriſt in the work: ſaying, *that our Saviour ſatisfied mmediately*, (i. e. by himſelf) *for the ault*, and *for the guilt of eternal death*, nd *mediately for the temporal puniſhment lſo, in as much as he affords us grace, whereby we our ſelves ſatisfy the Lord.*

Bel. l. 4. de pœnit. c. 15. porro. Immediatè pro culpa & reatu mortis æternæ, mediatè pro pœna etiam temporali, quatenus gratiam præbet, per quam ipſi nos Domino ſatisfacimus.

Had

Had he ſaid, *our Saviour ſatisfied for* [illegible] *Temporal puniſhment alſo*: ſo that it either wholly remitted to the Righteous or if any be inflicted, grace is given to bear it, and the affliction ſanctified to their advantage, even death it ſelf, with all other corporal infirmities and afflictions whatſoever: Had he ſpoke to this purpoſe, it had been wholſome doctrine.

VIII. That Reſervation of puniſhment whether it can hold after death.

Thus for his Antecedent or Propoſition, as concerning juſt perſons living *liable to ſome Temporal puniſhment* after forgiveneſs; which how far, and in what ſenſe, true, we have ſeen; Now let us ſee how ſuppoſing it true in the *Romiſh* ſenſe (as indeed it is not) he can transfer it from the living to the dead, that it may be a ground and proof of Purgatory after death, as they ſuppoſe it is of ſatisfactions in this life: for if ask, ſuppoſing ſuch perſons in this life liable to ſome temporall puniſhment, why ſhould they be ſo in the next? it reſts upon that falſe aſſertion of his Council, that ſuch puniſhment muſt be ſatisfied or paied either in this world or the world to come; for there is a third way, which * ſome have allowed: and that is, a removal of all the ſtains of ſin and guilt of puniſhment by the *final grace*, and in the paſſage of the ſoul from the

* *Vid Alenſ. ſumm. l. 4. qu. 15. mem. 3. artic. 3.*

he body: And how bold is this Author o make God *a respecter of persons*, if he hould not punish in the other world one hat had sinned *as David*, and not payed or it in this, *pa.* 187. for then he should ot (saith this Author) *reward every man according to his works?* But this is, irst, a bold inference upon the former alls supposal, of such punishments retain- d and inflicted in the Course of vindica- ive justice, if not satisfied for by us: whereas we saw three reasons against it, nd other purposes which God has in so etaining and inflicting punishment when he sees fit, for *chastisement*, *amendment*, *admonition* to others, and to shew how he is *displeased* with sin in his children; yea t is very profitable for us that he should retain and inflict it after forgiveness, as, and when he sees fit: But none of these purposes can hold in the punishments of Purgatory. Secondly, that *Rewarding every man according to his works*, is misapplied to sins of just persons forgiven: for the reward of punishment which God *without respect of persons* renders to works, is to works not reckoned for, *i. e.* not repented of, not forgiven: And whereas they will not allow that God either in mercy or justice, can remit the remainder of Temporal punishment, without

God no respecter of persons, if he forgive all Temporal punishment without our satisfaction.

without being a *Respecter of persons*: why do they contend for the power of *Indulgence* to be in the Pope? and allow him to be a *Respecter of persons*, as the Rich finde him to be? And whereas they hold Christ to entreat and intercede for souls in Purgatory, yet none come out upon his Intercession, but upon the Popes Indulgence.

IX. Papal Indulgences.

All they can pretend to here is, that by such Indulgencies the application of Christs merit and satisfaction is made. But why should they allow the Pope to be *a respecter of persons* in applying the merits of Christ with respect (as he does) to friends, or those that can pay well, when they will not allow God Almighty to dispense his own mercy or justice to them that have not satisfied here, unless they do it in Purgatory? or why do they allow the Pope to extend that power of *loosing* to souls in Purgatory (that is, under the earth) which was given to the Church, for *loosing only things* * *upon earth*? Indeed God has appointed many wayes and means in his Church of applying Christs satisfaction, such as *his Word, both Sacraments*, and *Absolution*: but as for the many new invented wayes of the Church of *Rome*, they are unwarrantable, and ineffectual to the purpose: deceiving the

*Mat. 16. 19. Mat. 18. 18.

the people not only of their money, but of their ſouls, by ſtaying on things that muſt be payed for, yet profit not, falſe applications of (what they pretend) the merits and ſatisfaction of our Saviour Chriſt.

Unto this debate of *Purgatory*, it will not be amiſs to adde ſomething concerning *ſatisfactions*. We do not here condemn, or deter people from *doing the things*, which in the language of the Church of *Rome*, come under the name of *ſatisfaction*, viz. thoſe Penals, ſelf-afflictives, acts of ſelf-denial, or ſuch ſpiritual exerciſes, or bodily auſterities reaſonably uſed that way: But we commend them as profitable, and to good purpoſe, if rightly undertaken and directed; only we cannot allow the *grounds* upon which that Church has eſtabliſhed her ſatisfactions, nor the *purpoſes* that Church ſeems to have in the commending or injoyning them.

X. Of ſatisfactions and of doing the things ſignified by that name.

The *grounds* we ſaw in the diſcourſe of Purgatory, *That God does retain part of the temporal puniſhment, which may by works of penance be remitted here in this world, or payed in the world to come*, as this Author expreſſes it, *pa.* 187. of this ſufficiently above. Nor can we allow the *purpoſes* (or at leaſt practiſes) of the Romiſh

miſh Church, in commending thoſe Penals as *meritorious* and *ſatisfactory* to Gods juſtice, that I may ſay nothing of the small *gain* that is made thereby. But we allow and commend the *doing of* these *things*, theſe ſelf-afflictives, Firſt, in order to the *obtaining of remiſſion* of ſin and punishment, ſo the *Sackcloth*, *Aſhes*, *Lying* on the ground; as in the *Ninivites Jon.* 3. this they do, not as having any merit, or ſatisfaction for puniſhment due by Gods juſtice unto ſin, nor yet as the prime conditions of forgiveneſs, but as expreſſions of that inward Repentance and humiliation, of which they are effects, and which they conduce to encreaſe, by a reaction or working back again upon the ſoule. Secondly, After forgiveneſs they are profitable when done, either *in reſpect to ſin paſt*, by way of wholſome diſcipline to make more wary of ſuch ſins, more careful to avoid them hereafter, and more diligent in doing the contrary duties; or when done in order to *the averting ſome Temporal judgment*, wherewith God might ſtrike us juſtly for ſome failing, remiſneſs, or want of due carefulneſs, as is requiſite for that avoiding of ſin, and performance of duty: For theſe are the fruits of Repentance, which God accepts as the great

and only ſatisfaction on our parts, as for thoſe Penals and bodily afflictives, they are pleaſing unto him ſo far as conduce to inforce care and ſtrength of the ſpirit againſt ſin, and as they are expreſſions and effects of that humiliation and Repentance, which is the Condition of forgiveneſs.

And theſe Afflictives or exerciſes of ſelf-denial, may be either voluntary undertaken of our ſelves, or by adviſe of the Prieſt, that has the *miniſtery of reconciliation*, and the *power of looſing* committed unto him: and the leſs that God does inflict on us, *i. e.* the greater proſperity, health, eaſe, quietneſs, that any man enjoys in the world: the more is he concerned to impoſe on himſelf ſuch acts of ſelf-denial, and keep the ſoul exerciſed by ſometimes afflicting the body, or elſe the fleſh will gather ſtrength againſt the ſpirit, and bring in the world too faſt into the ſoul.

Upon the aforeſaid Reſpects, we commend and allow *the things*, and leave it to the Church of *Rome* to draw Gods example, (his ſometime inflicting puniſhment after forgiveneſs) to their own advantage, and *make a General Rule* of it for themſelves to practiſe by.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Real Presence.

I. State of the Controversy.

THis Controversy about the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist the *Romanists* we finde, had rather dispute under the Title of *Real presence*, then of *Transubstantiation*: Whereas, First I do not observe, that the Ancients expressed the being of Christs body and blood in the Eucharist, by the word *presence*, but rather by affirming it *to be his body blood.*— And in the time of *Bertram Pascasius*, and so down to *Berengarius* the question was, *how it is his body*, and this more consonant to Scripture expression, *This is my body, this is my blood.* Secondly, Seeing we admit the old saying *præsentiam credimus, modum nescimus, We believe the presence, know not the mode manner:* it is needless for them to dispute about the *presence*, unless they adde the *mode* which they have defined *Transubstantiation.* For the Arguments that make against *Transubstantiation* conclude also (though not against all *presence*

preſence yet) againſt theirs. Their Councel alſo having defined in the firſt Canon, *that the body and blood of Chriſt*, are really and ſubſtantially contained in the Euchariſt, which ſpeaks a *preſence*, does in the next Canon define that which concerns the *mode*: the *not remaining of the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord.*

Durand proves the remaining of the ſubſtances of Bread and Wine, together with the body and blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt to be poſſible: and albeit he adheres to the way of Tranſubſtantiation, yet he grants that other way to be preſſed with fewer difficulties. It is indeed moſt evident, that he who denies *Tranſubſtantiation*, does not therefore deny a *Real preſence*: nor does the remaining of Bread and Wine in the Sacrament exclude the real preſence or communication of the body and blood of Chriſt, but cleares it of many Difficulties, and needleſs miracles, (which muſt accompany the way of Tranſubſtantiation) and makes a fairer interpretation of the words, *This is my body*, *This is my blood*: According to S. *Pauls* explication: *The bread which we break is communion of*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 10. to let us underſtand, where there is a due participation

In 4. ſent. diſt. 11. qu. 1.

of this *Bread broken*, and this *Cup bleſſed*, there is a real participation of the body and blood of our Saviour. Let the Romaniſts take away their mode of Tranſubſtantiation (which as we ſhall ſee by the following diſcourſe is preſſed with ſo many difficulties, infers ſo many inconveniencies) and we will not quarrel with them about a Real preſence or participation of Chriſts Body and Blood; believing ſuch a one is afforded as is fitting and neceſſary to all the ends and purpoſes of the Sacrament.

Now for the Arguments of Proteſtants, which equally ſerve againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, and againſt *their Real preſence*: Mr. *Spencer* ſets them down in this order, with his anſwers to them.

II. That the ſubſtance of bread remains.

The firſt is from the contexture of the words, as we have them in three *Evangeliſts*, and in S. *Paul.* 1 *Cor.* 11. that Jeſus *took* bread *bleſſed* it, *brake*, and *gave* to his Diſciples; which ſhews plainly, he *brake* and gave what he took and bleſſed; *true bread*, not the *ſpecies* only. His Anſwer is a denial that our Saviour gave what he took and bleſſed, the ſame ſubſtance of bread; and for a pretence of this denial, he complains of our tranſlation or addition of the word, *it* to *bleſſed*, *brake* and *gave*, which is not in the *Original*

inal Greek, nor the *Latine*: and upon this ſilly exception makes an invective againſt the cunning which Proteſtants uſe in their Tranſlations, *pa.* 194, 195. But he that knows any thing in thoſe languages *Greek* and *Latine*, finds they are not forced to repeat the pronoun *it*, as our *Engliſh* is; in which there would be elſe, but an imperfect ſenſe; and when it is not expreſſed in the other Languages, it muſt be implied to give a ſubject to thoſe tranſitive verbs, *bleſſed*, *brake*, *gave*. And if to make the ſenſe perfect, we ask what did he *bleſs*, *break*, and *give*? the ſubject firſt mentioned ſtill muſt be meant, unleſs the change be expreſſed in the ſtory, or made evident to the ſenſe: this rule he muſt grant, or elſe nothing can be certain in ſuch contextures of Scripture-language. It is ſaid 2 *Sam.* 23. 16. *They drew water and took, and brought to David.* So the *Greek*, *Latine*, and *Hebrew*; the *Engliſh* renders, took *it*, and brought *it*; Will he ſay, this is a fraud and falſification, as he complains here? But that he may ſee and acknowledge, how anſwerable the manner of ſpeech in the one is to the other: It follows, *David* ſaid (of it, or of that Water) *is not this the blood of theſe men*? anſwerable to theſe ſacramental ſpeeches of

the Text in hand, but of this manner of speech more hereafter.

III. A Rule to be observed in change of substances.

The second part of his answer, is by denying the Consequence: *therefore he gave the same in substance which he took*, the bread which he *took* being changed (as he will have it) into his body which he *gave*: as when in *Gallilee*, the Water was turned into Wine, it could not be thence proved, that as the servants filled the Vessels with natural Water, so they drew, and carried, and the Master of the feast drank natural water. But this is answered by the Rule above, *The subject first mentioned must still be meant, unless the change be expressed in the story*, or *made evident to sense*: Now we have it not either in the story of the institution of this Sacrament, or elsewhere expressed, that our Saviour would or did change the very bread into his very body, neither doth the effect or change sensibly appear, therefore it must follow, that what he *took* and *blessed*, the same also for substance he *gave*. As for those words, *this is my body*, they do not expressly speak a substantial change, but more sutable to the purpose of the Sacrament, admit another meaning, like as *Davids* speech (above mentioned) did, and many other such figurative speeches in Scripture do. And for

for his instance of the Water turned into Wine, *Joh.* 2. the story expressly speaks, and the senses evidently shewed then there was a change; and therefore though it follows not (as to that story) they filled water, therefore they drew and carried, and drank water, yet here it does follow, that as he *took bread*, and *blessed* it, so he *brake* bread and *gave* it, when neither the story nor the sense shewed such a change of the subject.

IV. Of breaking the bread which proves substance remaining.

The Second objection which he pretends Protestants do make, is of his own framing, and so may easily be answered by him. But thus I may object what he cannot answer. What our Saviour *brake* that he *gave*, but he *brake* substantial *bread*, therefore he *gave it*; The exception Mr. *Spencer* used in answer to the former objection, *viz.* He *gave* the same he *took*, *unless* it were *changed*, which they affirm it to be before he gave it, did not serve him there it will less here: for the affirming of such a change of the subject in such contextures of Scripture we found unreasonable, unless the story or our senses did evidence the change; but here its more unreasonable to answer, he *gave* what he *brake*, the same for substance, unless substantially changed: for

the end of our Saviours *breaking* it, was to give or distribute it to his Disciples: if therefore he changed the substantial Bread, which he *brake*, he did not give them, what he *brake* for them; and brake that which he *brake*, to no purpose; it being presently to be changed and annihilated. To *no purpose* I say, of Communion and distribution; which our Saviour intended in this Sacrament: For I acknowledge another purpose of *breaking*, and that *mystical*, to shew the breaking of his body on the Cross: which might hold, though the substance of the bread had been presently annihilated; but the other purpose of distribution must needs be frustrate; That this was the end and purpose of our Saviours breaking, the *Romish* Commentators upon the place acknowledge; saying our Saviour brake it into so many parts, that every Disciple might have one; But the Church of *Rome* does not break now, in order to *Communion*, or distributing to the people; but in order to a *sacrifice*, the Priest breaks a Wafer into three parts; and this onely to himself, not for others to take or receive.

Here they cannot serve themselves of the *Species*, as when they say of the eating, and shewing, (which is a breaking of

of the Sacrament with the Teeth) that the *Species* of the bread are only broken, the body of Christ remaining whole under them, which is senseless enough; but here in the breaking for distribution, more senseless, for it supposes only the species remaining to be distributed; which cannot answer the purposes of the Sacrament (*nourishing incorporation*, of which as inforcing the necessity of substantial bread to remain, more below) nor can it answer S. *Pauls* purpose in saying, *The bread which we break is it not the Communion of*, &c. Nor answer the purpose of the Scripture, expressing the Administration of this Sacrament by *the breaking of bread*; as sometimes in the *Acts* of the Apostles: Nor can they of the Church of *Rome* answer our Saviours command, *Do this*; They do not what our Saviour did, they do not break bread; the bread they use, is broken for them by the Baker, those little portions of bread or wafers being severed from one another by him or her that makes them, before they come to the Priests hands, nay before they come into the Oven, and are fit for eating. If they say they *break* i. e. *distribute*; that indeed is sometime signified by *breaking*, and is implied consequentially in that phrase

phrase or expression *breaking of bread*, and in S. *Pauls*, the *bread we break*, for they did *break* it (as our Saviour also) to the end they might distribute it. But this will acknowledge the *substance of Bread* in the distribution, *i. e.* after Consecration; and still the Argument from our Saviours *breaking bread* is good, for he *brake* it to that end, to *give* and distribute it.

In the next objection *p.*200. which is also much of his own framing, he speaks something of *breaking*, but uncertainly—whether our Saviour *brak before* those words *This is my body*, or while our Saviour was speaking them, or after they were spoken, *i. e.* after Consecration; if he will fix on the last, as he seems most inclined to do, there is enough said against it, from that senseless supply they make by the *Species* and accidents of the bread, from that expression of *breaking bread*, from S. *Pauls*, *the bread we break*—and further from that representation of Christs body broken on the Cross, intended in the *breaking* of the Sacramental element; therefore Saint *Paul*, to *this my body*, adds, *which is broken for you*.

1 Cor. 11.

The

The next objection or Argument of Protestants is upon the word *this*— when our Saviour said *this*, it must signify what he took and held in his hand, and so the proposition must be *This* bread *is my body*: He answers *pa.* 206. by demanding, whether our Saviour when he turned Water into Wine, *Joh.* 2. could not truly have said: *This is Wine*, the water remaining when the word *this* was pronounced, and changed, when the whole proposition was spoken? But we reply, this is to change the Case, which enquires *de facto* of the deed or being, to that which enquires *de possibili*, of the possibility. The question is, whether the words *This is Wine*, or *this is my body*: do of themselves imply such a change, there being nothing else evidently shewing us the change done or to be done? if they do, then is there no certainty in speech, (as was shewen above) no not in Indicative propositions, as these are, and should be therefore most punctual and determinate in their affirming or denying any thing.

V. What the word (*this*) denotes.

As for the possibility or power of changing one substance into another we doubt not of: but if that change be to be signified by the proposition *this is Wine*, (the first substance *Water*, remaining when

when the word *this* is pronounced, the proposition must have this sense to make it true, *this water shall be changed into wine*, so *is* must be put for *shall*, which the word *is* cannot of it self import: nor be that way intelligible without some declaration of the change done, or about to be done. So the Argument above from the thing present under the word *this*: though not good against all possibility of change (nor is it intended against that) yet always good against the intelligibleness, or determinate signification of such propositions, if intended to import a change, without signifying otherwise by some clear evidence it is done or to be done: so it was in *that change Ioh.* 2. but nothing to clear the change they would have signified in *This is my body*. Another Difference between the change of that Water into Wine, and the supposed change in the Sacrament, and therefore a difference between *this is wine* spoken of the first, and *this is my body*, affirmed of the other: because that Wine was made of the Water, the same matter remaining: which they cannot, dare not say of Christs body, that it is so made of *bread*. Again, another difference; (I note these, because he so oft makes use of this instance, as adæquate to the change he supposes in the

the Sacrament) Although the Water was turned into wine, yet not into the same wine which the Governour of the feast had, or which was existent before: but here the *bread* is by them said to be turned into not only flesh, and wine into blood, but into Christs flesh or body, and into Christs blood, which were existent before. So that whereas he infers, so *bold are Protestants in restraining the omnipotency of God, to defend their own groundless phantasies, pa.* 207. We may more justly say, so bold are Romanists in obliging Gods omnipotency (without any signification of his will) to work miracles, to make good their phansies, yea such miracles as they can give no examples or instances for, nor any indication in the story that he did, or would engage his omnipotency to work such a miraculous chang.

VI. His pretended Instances for the word (*This*) to denote a thing future.

The Instances he brings for like manner of speech, wherein the word *this* speaks the thing not present but about to be, come not home to the purpose; as *This is my commandment, that ye love.* — *This is a circle*, when but part of it drawn: and *this is fire*, speaking of flax kindled, as those words are pronounced, *p.* 208, 209. The first instance is of *words to be spoken*, as the subject of *this*, and do to any mans apprehension refer necessarily to the future,

ture, or that which follows in speech: but the case is quite different, when there is a visible substance as bread, taken and held up while the pronoun demonstrative *this* is pronounced, and must in any mans apprehension point it out. The other two instances are of *successive* Mutations, and *visible*. Of which after begun, it is intelligible if said, *this is a Circle*. For he that hears the words, and sees the thing knows what it means: but the change or mutation they suppose made and signified by these words, *this is my body*, is instantaneous and invisible, which is not begun when the words are begun but accomplisht in a moment when they are fully spoken: and cannot have truth in proper speech till then: nor that truth be understood till the supposed change *become visible*, or be *expresly affirmed* to be done. If they can shew this of their *change* they contend for by those words, then we shall understand and believe it true, and then we wall admit the sense he gives of the words, pa. 211. *This which I am to give you, and which ye are presently to eate, is my body*, but till he can shew us expres declaration of such a change, or evidence of sight for it; he must give us leave to think the sense Saint *Paul* puts upon those words, *This is my body*,

body, by saying, *The bread* (that is, *this bread*) *which we break is the Communion of my body* far better and fitter to rest on.

VII. Ingenuity of Protestants in this point.

Whereas, pa. 213. he commends the ingenuous profession, and good disposition of the Protestant, that acknowledging bread remaining, yet believes it to be the body of Christ, because he has said, *this is my body*: though he cannot comprehend how this may be: it is the profession of all true Protestants. And there would be no question made of the *Presence*, if the Romanists would be so ingenuous as to rest satisfied in it, and not so contend about the *Mode*, their conceit of *transubstantiation*; as I noted at the beginning of this discourse; and would have the Reader note diligently, that notwithstanding the former objections for the remaining of Bread in substance: yet are they not brought to exclude, or prove any thing against, the true presence but the Romish conceited presence, of Christs body.

VIII. Remembrance of Christ made in the Sacrament excludes not a real presence.

The next objection or argument of the Protestants is from *Do this in remembrance of me*; of which I must say, this argument is not to be pressed against, the true presence of Christs body and blood in the Sacrament, from the importance

tance of the word *remembrance* which is of things paſt, not preſent; but firſt, more directy concludes againſt their propitiatory ſacrifice of the Maſs, which they pretend to be the very ſame with that ſacrifice on the Croſs: we ſay as ſome Fathers do, that the Euchariſt is a commemorative ſacrifice, a *ſhewing* or *commemoration*, an application of that ſacrifice of our Saviours, therefore not the ſame. Secondly, though by the importance of the word *remembrance*, it conclude not againſt a *true preſence* as I ſaid; yet may it againſt their manner of preſence, by *Tranſubſtantiation*; becauſe that takes away the preſence of ſubſtantial bread, that is, of the *Sacramental Element*, which is the neceſſary ſubject upon which paſſes what is done in the *Sacrament* for the *ſhewing* of the Lords death, and for the commemorating of his body broken, his blood ſhed upon the Croſs; which the very body and blood of Chriſt put in the place of the ſubſtantial Elements, cannot ſupply: therefore he thinks himſelf concerned *pa.* 224, to 229. to ſhew how the ſame thing may in diverſe reſpects be a remembrance of it ſelf. Therefore to omit his Cavilling or trifling, *pa.* 220, 221. that what our Saviour did could not then be a *Remembrance*,

rance, for that is of things past, and Christ himself was present, and his passion was to come; To which we briefly ay, and he cannot deny it, that our *Saviour* in his first institution did mean and ppoint this *Sacrament* for a Remembrance of Him, and therefore said, *do this n Remembrance of me*: and for that first ime it was enough to be the shewing or epresentation of his death, and for ever fter both representation and remembrance of it; but both then and after, he exhibition and communication of his body and blood to all purposes of the *Sacrament*. The Paschal Lamb, or blood of the Lamb, sprinkled on the door-posts was *a remembrance* of the Angels passing over — and for that called the *Passover*: nd for that purpose instituted, as appears *Exod.* 12. Yet *primâ vice*, at that first ime, it was not in proper force of the Word, a *Remembrance*, for it was done before the Angel passed over.

But we need not spend time about this, see how he endeavours to shew the same thing may be in diverse respects a *Remembrance* of it self? *viz.* by doing some action bring to remembrance something he had done himself: This is true, and so our Saviour shall *be seen of them that pierced him*, *Zach.* and therein shall be a remem-

IX. The same body not a Remembrance or Sacrament of it self.

remembrance of what was done to him but this nor any other instance brought can make it good in the *Sacrament*: for here we affirm, nothing can be a Sacramental remembrance of it self; because that confounds the essential parts of a Sacrament, making the same thing the *Sign* and the thing *Signified*, Visible corporeal, and invisible incorporeal. The Apostle saith plainly, *So oft as ye eat the bread—— ye shew the Lords death*: therefore they are forced to say, and use such speeches as this Author doth pa. 211. in ult, *the body of Christ made a Sacrament*; and so the same thing must be a Sacrament of it self; which comes in with the former absurdity, a sacramental representation and remembrance of it self and yet altogether invisible. But it may be said the Actions in the *Sacrament* are visible. True; yet this will not salve the matter, notwithstanding the explication he makes pa. 227. which is but a handsome disguise. *Hence*, saith he, *appears, that the very same body which was given, and that very blood that was shed for us, remaining in its own proper substance* (but *after an invisible manner*) *by reason of the visible actions—— puts us in remembrance of the same body blood and person so many years agoe, given, shed, crucified*; nay

ay but thoſe viſible actions ſeen in the Sacrament, (ſeeing they paſs not upon the body which they fix under the *ſpecies* in place of the ſubſtantiall bread, for that body of Chriſt they grant is impaſſible,) do tell us the body cannot be by reaſon of them a remembrance of it ſelfe; ſeeing alſo that body is inviſible, & thoſe actions cannot appear to be terminated upon it, therefore it cannot be made a *S*acrament, or ſacramental remembrance; for what is ſo muſt by the ſenſes inſtruct and minde us of the thing repreſented and not ſeen; ſo that according to this Romiſh phanſy, the *ſpecies* and nothing elſe muſt be the ſacrament, and ſacramental remembrance, and in them muſt all thoſe ſacramental actions be terminated; which abſurdity ſhews the neceſſity of ſubſtantial Bread remaining, even upon this account alſo, of ſacramental repreſentation and remembrance; not excluding as I ſaid a *true preſence* of Chriſts body and blood, but the *Romiſh mode of preſence* by tranſubſtantiation, which takes away the ſubſtantial element of the ſacrament.

X.

The Cup called the New Teſtament.

The next objection he ſets down thus; *The Cup is called by our Saviour the New Teſtament, for that it was a holy ſigne of the New Teſtament*, pa. 230. This is careleſly ſet down, but let us ſee what he ſaith

saith to it; instead of giving a direct answer he first challenges any Protestant to produce any clear text of Scripture, where that reason mentioned in the objection is alledged; but if he had fully set down the objection, the force of it (as we shall see presently) would have extorted this to be the reason why it is called the New Testament; which must needs be a figurative speech; and therefore implying it to be the signe, Sacrament, or seal of the New Testament; confirmed in his blood; secondly, instead of a direct answer, he gives us a needless discourse of the signification of the *New Testament*, and then answers, *I deny that by New Testament is understood a signe of the New Testament, but truly and really the New Testament it self*, 233. this is a careless mistake, for *New Testament* in the objection is taken for that which is truly the New Testament it self: nor does it imply, that by New Testament is understood the signe of the New Testament; but that the verb *is* which couples *this* and the *new Testament* together, is put for *significat*, *signifies*, or is *the signe*. Thirdly, from *Exod.* 24. 8. where the Testament of God with the Israelites was confirmed with blood, and the like saying used, *This is the blood of the testament which the Lord hath made with*

with you, it muſt be real blood, not a ſigne or figure of it, which is here called the blood of the Teſtament, for ſuch a ſolemn Teſtament required no leſs, but rather more, then that in *Exodus*, to be confirmed with true blood, pa. 235,236. This is true, but here's his failing, firſt that the true blood by which our Saviours Teſtament was confirmed, and to which that in *Exodus*, and all other ſprinklings of blood under the Law referred, was the blood ſhed on the Croſs, as the Apoſtle plainly ſhews in the Epiſtle to the *Hebr.* whereas this Author refers it to the blood in the Sacrament, which is not the confirmation of the Teſtament, but by reference to the blood on the Croſs. Secondly, he gives us no direct ſenſe of the propoſition, *this Cup is the new Teſtament in my blood:* to exempt it from that figurative manner of ſpeech, which we contend our Saviour uſed throughout this Sacrament. He acknowledges it to be in the Canon of the Maſſe, and they ſay it dayly in ſaying the Maſſe: and could not but know, that the neceſſity of a figurative ſpeech to be admitted in that propoſition, was the intent and force of the former objection, yet gives us no account of it; knowing that if a figure be admitted here, why *not in this is my body?*

And

And if the words were *operative* there for turning the bread into his body, why not here for transubstantiating the Cup to that which was in it, into the New Testament? If it be replied, that St. *Luke* and St. *Pauls* words must be interpreted by St. *Matthews*, *this is my blood of the new Testament*: first, it is more probable those other were the words our Saviour spake, because of the agreement of Saint *Luke* and St. *Paul*, and because St. *Paul* saith, *he delivered what he received of the Lord*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. The Canon of the Masse also retains the same words. Secondly, they cannot be reduced to Saint *Matthews* words without a figure, for they must then sound thus, *this Cup is my blood of the new Testament*: but saith Mr. *Spencer*, our Saviour never said, *this cup is my blood*, no more then he said *this bread is my body*, pa. 238. And this in abhorrence of the figurative speech, that must be admitted in saying *this bread is my body*, and answerably in saying, *this Cup is my blood*: yet in the same place he acknowledges our Saviour said, this *Cup is the New Testament*, and is willing to overlook the most apparent figurative speech in it, notwithstanding that the force of the objection rested chiefly upon it, and provoked him to a direct answer.

The

The next objects to them their diſagreement about the word *this*, in our Saviours ſaying *this is my body* 241. where note briefly, that declining, the explication of *this is* for *this ſhall become*, or ſhall be *tranſubſtantiated*; for then ſaith he, by *this* muſt be underſtood *bread*, yet pag. 243. being to anſwer for one of their opinions that ſaith by the word *this*, is ſignified *nothing preſent*: he grants, by *this* is ſignified *nothing preſent* preciſely in that moment, when the word *this* was pronounced: but preſent after conſecration; what is this but to put the word *is* upon the future, after *Conſecration*? And what is that but *ſhall be*? And who ever heard that the word *is* properly taken (as they will have it here) ſhould not preciſely ſignifie the preſent time or exiſtence? Or who ever heard that the pronoun *this* ſhould not be demonſtrative? Or ſignifie nothing in that moment preſent when our Saviour held up bread, and ſaid *this*? Nor is this diſagreement about the *mode*, as among the Proteſtants: for they agree about the ſubject and predicate of this propoſition, that by *this* is meant *bread*, by *body*, the true body of Chriſt, only differ about the *manner*, how it is made ſo, or how that body and blood are preſent in the ſacrament. But the *Romaniſts*

XI. Diſagreement of Romaniſts about the words of conſecration; This is my body.

cannot agree what is the *subject* of the proposition, or what is meant by *this*, cannot agree about the words of consecration: the more general opinion is the false one, which places it in these words *This is my body*, making them operative to their transubstantiation; whereas the *Ancients* placed the Consecration, in *recitatione & invocatione*, not so much in the pronouncing these words, as in prayer and Invocation; and so our Saviour's *blessing* and giving thanks belongs to the Consecration, as well as his saying *this is my body*.

And Mr. *Spencer* however he would have this saying of our Saviours so clear for *Transubstantiation*, knows that some *School-men* and others of their Doctrine have spoken plainly, that the Scripture and that saying of our Saviours in particular does not infer Transubstantiation without the definition of their Church and indeed the different opinions in explaining of it, or drawing it to the purpose speaks as much.

XII. Called bread after Consecration,

The next thing remarkable, is the objection of S. *Pauls* calling it often *bread* after Consecration —1 *Cor.* 11.— which Mr. *Spencer* returns these pitiful answers. 1. He helps himself of his old instance, of the Water made Wine *by*

nd called Water after; for it is ſaid v. 9. *aſted the water, that was made wine* pag. 51. But the Text ſpeaks alſo plainly hat it was not water, but made wine. . S. *Paul* ſaith not it is *common or natu-l bread*, Nor *will the Proteſtants ſay ſo*, *herefore* with them when S. *Paul* calls it *read* before and after Conſecration, *hough the name bread be the ſame, yet the* ubſtance is not the ſame. So the *Catho-ke* may give, ſaith he, the ſame anſwer, hat before Conſecration, *bread* in Saint *Paul* is *natural* bread, after *ſupernatu-l, ſpiritual, divine* bread. p. 252, 253. his is but a ſlender diſguiſe, which any ye that can diſtinguiſh ſubſtances from ualities, may ſee thorow: for as we ny it is *common* or *mere natural* bread fter conſecration, ſo we affirm it is *ſub-ſtantial bread*, bread to be eaten; *So oft e yeat this bread*, 1 *Cor.* 11. and there-ore although the Proteſtants allow ſuch change in the bread, notwithſtanding . *Paul* calls it *bread* before and after Conſecration: yet will not the change which the Romaniſts make, conſiſt with . *Pauls* calling it *bread*, for they take away the whole ſubſtance and nature of read, and leave nothing but the *ſpecies* r *qualities* of Bread; to ſupply the uſes of the Sacrament. And what if our Sa-

viour *termeth himself bread*, Jo. which at first sight is a figurative speech S. *Paul* cannot be so answered, when calls that which was truly bread, bre still: nor they excused, who seek to h themselves by figures, when the Sac mental bread is called bread, (*viz.* wh it is indeed) and allow no figure, when is called *his body*; viz. what it is in fig fication and exhibition, He conclud *It can no more be gathered, from its b termed bread by S.* Paul, *that it is natur substantial bread, then it can be gathe from the Canon of our Mass, that we lieve it to be the substance of bread, bec it is often called Bread in the same Ca after Consecration*, p. 252. There many passages in the Canon of your M which did not alter with the times, a may confute your novelties, and repro your not believing according to that C non, speaking yet the Ancient langua and belief; It cannot be gathered by t Canon of your Mass (so far as is an ent) what ye do believe, but what ought.

XIII. A further enforcement of the same.

The inforcement of the former objec on: If by the word *bread* often repeat S. *Paul* should understand *flesh*, he wo have warned the people to believe it though the senses shewed it bread:

wo

ould not have joyned himself to the
port of the senses (against the persua-
on of faith) calling it always bread
thout any explication; He answers
re, by his former impertinency of the
ritual food of the soul call'd *bread*; and
hrists *flesh* called *bread*: *Io.* 6. which
ft, was not a joyning with the report
our senses, but telling us what we must
lieve it to be *in effect*: and so under-
and it was a figurative speech. And se-
ondly, this that S. *Paul* calls *bread* was
bstantial bread before consecration,
nd his calling it still *bread* shews it conti-
ued so still: tells us we must believe it
be so still, unless he had admonisht us
the change into flesh. His retorting
pon the Protestants is vain; *If S.* Paul
this word bread *so often repeated should*
derstand a Sacrament or Mystery, as it
believed among Christians; were he not
be blamed for holding the people in error:
ing he knew that sense and reason, giveth
idence that it is usual and common
read, &c. p. 255. and in anger concluds,
Protestants bring Arguments fitter for In-
dels then Christians. ibid. But there was
o cause for him to be so moved: seeing
here is a great difference between our
rgument or Reasoning and his, as much
s between, this is *not bread*, and this is

not *common bread*: It is not true, th
reason as he saith, *giveth evidence, tha*
is common bread; sense may, becaus
cannot discern between *holy* and *comm*
but he that can use his *reason*, as all th
know any thing belonging to Sacrame
or Religion, knows also, by what he hea
and sees said and done for the consecra
ting or setting apart the elements for ho
ly use, that it is not *common bread*. Th
Apostle also saies enough to take off thi
mistake or errour, by calling it *this brea*
and this *Cup of the Lord*, and threatnin
judgment unto the unworthy receiver, a
guilty of the Lords body, and because the
discern not the Lords body; which is e
nough to exclude all conceit of it, as
common bread, though not to infer it
no more bread, but *the very body*, as he
would have it concluded from those ex
pressions of the Apostle, p. 255. Nor does
his similitude come home. *A subject* (said
he) *cannot be said to be guilty of the bod*
and blood of the King, that receives not his
signet with that reverence, as becomes a
subject, ibid. I say this comes not home,
as any may see that knows what a great
difference there is between *moral* signs
or tokens and *sacramental*; for these are
not only significant and representative,
but exhibitive, and communications of

the

the thing signified, and in them offered: they carry it along with them, and therefore he is *guilty of the body and blood*, who receives this Sacrament unworthily.

XIV. Their impertinent instances they bring to parallel it.

So omit his needless discourse of the *fruit of the Vine* mentioned in the Gospel: it is familiar with Romish writers in answer to S. *Pauls calling it bread* after consecration, to use the help of such speeches, *Dust thou art*, because made of Dust; and the *serpent* call'd a *Rod*, because made of *Aarons Rod*, and the *Wine* call'd *water*, *Jo. 2. 9.* because made of *water*: so the body of our Lord by S. *Paul* call'd *bread*, because made of it: yet dare not stand to it, when we reply: The former things are call'd so, because of the same matter remaining in the thing made, which was in that, of which it is made; but not so in this making of Christs body, which was but once made, and that of the seed or blood of the blessed Virgin: Mr. *Spencer* being put to speak to this point, goes backward and forward: he acknowledges *p.* 266. by reason of the subject which remains common to both (in philosophy call'd *Materia prima*, the first matter) *Adam* was called *Dust*, and the *Serpent* a *Rod*; and acknowledges *p.* 269. that our Saviours body cannot be said to be so

made of bread; and therefore muſt acknowledge thoſe former uſual inſtances to be impertinent. This is backward.

Now ſee how he ſtrives forward to maintain the ſpeech, *made of bread. The body of Chriſt ſucceeds to the ſubſtance of bread under the ſame Accidents, and ſo iſſues from it as the day iſſues from the night,* as *from the terme from which it begins to be, as one may ſay* ex nocte fit Dies, *the day is made of the night,* ſo ex pane fit corpus Chriſti, *Chriſts body is made of bread,* as *it is myſteriouſly in this Sacrament,* and *therefore might be called bread after conſecration,* p. 269. Therefore it might be called—Wherefore? becauſe, forſooth, it is made of it, as *the day of the night*; but he ſhould have ſaid as the day is called night, becauſe it ſucceeds end comes in place of it, as the body of Chriſt, (according to their Tenet) doth inſtead or place of the bread: and he might have bethought himſelf whether ever any man call'd *Day Night*? or whether this be not *tranſlocation* or *ſucceſſion* rather then *Tranſubſtantiation*? and whether for ſuch a ſuppoſed tranſlocation the body of Chriſt can be called *bread,* as we ſee S. *Paul* often aſſerting bread after Conſecration: He has ſome

ſtreins

streins of invention in the pages following: as this. That *the flesh of Christ at least in some part was made of bread*— he means by way of nourishment from the bread our Saviour did eat: but not knowing how to make use of this impertinency in this question, he lets it fall.

XV. Their pretended Reason why S. *Paul* calls it Bread so oft.

But the *compleat reason of Catholicks* (saith he) *why S* Paul *calls the Sacrament bread after the consecration, is because the flesh of Christ into which the bread is changed, is put under the species of bread, which gives occasion of giving it the same denomination it had before*, p. 272. What had before that denomination of *bread*? the *species* or the *flesh of Christ*? neither surely: such careless expressions he every where takes hold of, when they fall from his Adversary: and can spend whole pages against them. But this *compleat reason* was no reason to S. *Paul*, neither did it give him any occasion of giving it still the same denomination of bread, for then he had *joyned with the report of sense* against faith; and had deceived them, in bidding them *eat that bread*, if nothing but species of bread remained. For albeit things set out to sight only may bear the names of the things they are like: yet not when proposed for use, which re-

quires the substance of the things, as *seeing* does; you may say of things painted, this is bread, these are grapes: but if you say of them, take, and eat, this is bread, these are grapes, you mock those that you invite to eat. Which shews also the impertinency of *Bellarmines* instance (of the *brazen serpent*, bearing the denomination of *serpent* from the outward likeness) to enforce this *compleat reason*, for that serpent was only for sight, to be looked on, not for stinging.

But this is all the reason the *Romanists* can give; and these poor *species* the form, colour, smell, appearance of bread, must help them at every turn; they must stand for substance when there is occasion, must be the visible part or signe of the Sacrament, must be broken, eaten nourish; what not?

XVI. As for those sayings, *I am the Vine, I am the Door*, I need not follow him in examining the differences he seeks out between them, and *this is my body*: but thus far they be appliable to our purpose: that they were figurative speeches, yet was our Saviour truly so, that is, what a Door or Vine is in their kinde, and uses, such was our Saviour spiritually indeed and in truth. So what the bread and wine is to the corporal effects being eaten

and

and drunk, that the body and blood of our Saviour taken by faith, is spiritually, and to the spiritual effect, (it is the very expression of their Council of *Florence*,) and as the Sacramental Bread and Wine are really offered and given, so is the body and blood of our Saviour in the Sacrament really and to all the purposes of the Sacrament, given and communicatd to them that have faith to receive it: for this the Sacramental bread after consecration is called (and made to us) *the body of Christ*, or (as St. *Paul* expresses it) is the *communication of his body*. Upon occasion of shewing difference between Christs saying, *my flesh is bread*, and his saying, *this is my body*: he has something which may seem in part to make reply to that which was presently delivered. *Bread* (saith he of the first saying) *cannot signifie true and material bread*: bu in the other, by *my body is signified the real natural body of Christ*, 281. What does he infer? That by *bread* in the *Protestant doctrine* is signified *real, material bread*, which cannot *be his body*, p. 282. We grant, that when our Saviour said, *this is my body*, he meant his true natural body, which was broken and given for us, but why cannot it be said truly of real and material bread after consecration *this bread*

Omnem effectum quem materialis cibus & potus quoad vitam agunt corporalem, hoc idem quoad vitam spiritualem, & hoc Sacramentum operatur. Concil. Floren.

bread is my body? It cannot indeed be properly said so, but may after the use of Sacramental speeches, as when said that *rock* was *Christ*: by *rock* is meant the real and natural rock out of which the water flowed, and by partaking thereof they were really made partakers of the spiritual drink: much more in the Sacrament of the New Testament, the *Bread* may be truly called the body of Christ, because in the due partaking thereof we are made partakers not only of the spiritual effects of Christs death, but also of his very body and blood bringing along with it those spiritual effects and graces: which is that St. *Paul* saith the *bread* is the *communion or communication of the body* of Christ; the manner we know not (as we said above of the presence) but believe the communication of it to all the purposes of the Sacrament.

XVII. Bread how Sacrament of his body.

But hear a great subtilty; *that bread should be a Sacrament of his body cannot* (saith he) *stand with the Protestant doctrine: which in the little Catechisme defines a Sacrament to be an outward visible signe of an inward spiritual grace; but our Saviours body in the first institution was as visible as the bread: and though after Ascention his body became invisible by reason of the distance, yet that makes it not an inward*

ward spiritual grace — his conclusion is, *therefore bread could not be the Sacrament of his body*, 283. Mr. *Spencer* surely thought he was dealing with children that had newly learnt their Catechisme: for see him presently afraid this should be returned upon themselves, He knows first, that albeit our Saviours body was in the first institution visible, and so it is still visible in it self; and knows also that no men make more use of his invisibilitie in the Sacrament, then the *Romanists* do, His body is *broken*, *eaten*, blood *shed*, *drunk* in the Sacrament, invisibly, — yea, all this *really* done (but invisibly) when he was visible himself to the Apostles in the first institution, and before his body was indeed *broken*, or his blood *shed* on the Cross. Thus can they make all good by the virtue of this word *invisible*, yet will not allow Protestants to make Christs body and blood the inward spiritual part of the Sacrament, because he was visible. Nay but though he *be now invisible*, yet is not his body the *inward spiritual grace*: this is Mr. *Spencers* subtiltie: but he that makes the blood go along with the body, that who receives the one, has the other too, might allow us here a *concomitancy* of *Christs body* and the *spiritual grace*, which as I said, goes alwayes along with it: so that

that as in the general definition of a Sacrament it is said, *signe of an inward spiritual grace*, so in respect of this particular Sacrament it may be said *signe of Christs body and blood*, which is here by the outward visible part of the Sacrament represented, conveyed with all the spiritual effects and graces.

XVIII. Mr. *Spencers* several confessions of truth in this point of the Sacrament.

Well, we are to thank him for venting that subtiltie, for it brings him presently to plain confession of truth; he did see that by his former precious argument against the Protestants, any man might think (if he were in earnest) it would follow, there is no Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: and therefore he subjoyns, pag. 283. line ult. *yet we are not constrained to acknowledge there is not a Sacrament*: why? For it signifies that *heavenly and divine grace, which by vertue of it is given to nourish our souls, which is truly inward and spiritual*, this is well; but if the spiritual grace be *given by vertue of it*, i. e. the Sacrament; does not the Sacrament give that grace by vertue of Christs body given in it? Yea, we hear him presently acknowledging also *that our Saviours body invisibly existent in this Sacrament and nourishing our souls, may be truly called a spiritual grace, and inward too, when it is Sacramentally received.*

very

very good all this. But is there no sign of this body? Hear him also saying, *that which sensibly appears and is called* Sacramentum tantum, *the Sacrament only, is a Sacramental sign of our Saviours body*, p. 284. All this acknowledged to the defiance of his former subtiltie, and what could a Protestant desire more? Only when he said *nourishing our souls*, he adds *and our bodies*, which I take to be a slip; for it is not the doctrine of his Church to say, Christs body nourishes our bodies. And now in the name of God why should he not acknowledge the advantage of truth to be on the Protestants side, for thus far we agree that there is divine grace by vertue of the Sacrament given to nourish our souls; that, that which appears in the Sacrament is the Sarramental signe of our Saviours body: that our Saviours body is truly existent, or given in the Sacrament; that our Saviours body nourishes our souls.

XIX. Transubstantiation a wrong to the Sacrament several wayes.

Now in the difference between us, see which has the advantage. 1. That *which sensibly appears* (saith he) *and is called* Sacramentum tantum: *is the Sacramental signe of our Saviours body*; but what is that which appears, he tells you presently, those *shews* and *species*, under which he will have Christs body to exist;

but

but are these fit to bear the name of a Sacrament? Of the Sacramental signe of a body? (What advantage would this have given to *Marcion* in his conceit of our Saviours body, as phantastical, and in shew and appearance only?) Can these *shews* and *appearances* of bread serve to the uses of the Sacrament, the corporal *breaking*, the *eating*, the *nourishing*? Whereas Protestants retaining the substance of the Sacramental element, *Bread*, preserve the outward part of the Sacrament, and all the uses of it: without which the Sacrament is maimed, if not destroyed: preserve I say the outward part, without prejudice to the inward, which is Christs body and blood, for we hold of it as above, existent, really given, and nourishing the soul; which is the full purpose of the Sacrament as to the inward spiritual part. But 2. they prejudice the inward spiritual part, by making it *existent under those shews or species*, (as he saith here) for how would this have confirmed *Eutychians* if it had been really the doctrine of the Church then, who upon the mistake of the Churches doctrine, as *Theodoret* in his Dialogues shews, made semblance for their heresie, saying the humanity of Christ is swallowed up into the divinity, shape and figure remaining as the

Bread

bread is in the *Sacrament*, shape only and appearance remaining. Again, they binde our *Saviours* body so to these *shews* and *species* of *bread*, that Christs body and they make *unum quid*, but *one thing*, so that Christs body goes along with them whersoever they go, or are cast, into the mouthes and stomacks of wicked men, and stayes whersoever the *species* are, till putrefaction of the species (if they without the body of Bread be capable of it) drive the body of Christ away. This and hundred prejudices and inconveniences follow upon this unnecessary phansie of putting Christs body under the species, in the place of substantial bread: we, as was said, preserve the *Sacrament* intire, acknowledging the very body and blood really given in the *Sacrament* to every one that comes duly to receive; given I say to all the purposes of the *Sacrament*.

What he sayes p. 285. *The words of Institution This is my body, are properly and literally to be understood, when there is nothing that constrains us to the contrary*: might pass for a truth, if he did not suppose *there is nothing constrains*. All the former inconveniences, inconsistencies, with many more tending to contradiction, do constrain to the contrary.

To

XX. Sacramental speeches in the Old Test.

To avoid the Argument from the manner of the Old Testament, in calling the *signes* by the names of the *things signified*: as *circumcision* call'd the *Covenant*; and such is the name *Passover*: He strangly phansies two Covenants made with *Abraham* in that one chapter *Gen.* 17. the first in 2, 3, 4, 5. *verses*, the other *verse* 9. as if he understood not that in every Covenant, there is a mutual stipulation, the promise on Gods part, the condition to be performed on mans, to which he consents and engages. That first Covenant (which he phansies) contained Gods promise to *Abraham*, and that which he required of *Abraham*, was in general expressed in the first *verse*, viz. *to walk before God and be perfect*: Now that which this Author calls the other Covenant, was but the imposing of Circumcision, as the signe of that Covenant, made with *Abraham* and his posterity, and a witness of their engagement to him: as it is plain *ver.* 11. where it is called the token or signe of the Covenant. And if this were a new Covenant, where are the promises of it? He confesses as much, when he saith, The second Covenant was a signe and seal of the first, only he abusively calls that the *second Covenant*, which he should have called Circumcision: for so

S. Paul,

S. *Paul*, whom he cites, saith, *he received the sign of Circumcision, the seal of righteousness, Rom.* 4. 12. And so his own instance he brings p. 287. makes against him: *for that promise of favour and Patronage* one of inferiour rank, is but part of their agreement; and that *waiting* on him once a year, is the other part, the condition to be performed, as a testification of his service and obligation.

To the objection of the *Lamb* called the *Passover*, *Exod.* 12. he answers: 1. The Scripture does not expressly call the *Lamb*, the Passover. 2. He saith by *Passover* is meant the feast of the Passover kept to the Lord, as *v.* 11. of that Chapter, *pa.* 289, 290. It is true the Feast was call'd the Passover, but so was the *Lamb*, and that more chiefly and immediately: *ver.* 21. ye *shall kill the Passover*, and elsewhere *eat the Passover*. So *Mat.* 26. 17. *eat the Passover*, *v.* 29. they made ready the Passover, *Mar.* 14. 12. *killed the Passover*: in all these the *Lamb* is the *Passover*, and from the killing and eating that, the yearly *feast* or celebration, is also by figure, called the *Passover*. And the *Lamb* called *Passover*, by a figure, in reference to the Angels passing over the houses of the Israelites.

Unto 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. *The Rock was Christ*,

Chriſt, he anſwers, the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of any Rock which was the ſigne of Chriſt, a viſible material rock, but of a ſpiritual rock: now Chriſt was that ſpiritual rock, truly, really, and ſo no figure, *pa.* 294. Here to avoid one rock of a figurative ſpeech in thoſe words, he falls upon two: for firſt, he muſt hereby acknowledge that all the Iſraelites did eat really of Chriſt, and drink of him, as we under the goſpel do, if by that ſpiritual meat, and ſpiritual drink Chriſt be immediately meant; but this the *Romaniſts* carefully avoid, anſwering the *Iſraelites* did eat the ſame ſpiritual meat (*Manna*) and drank the ſame ſpiritual drink *among themſelves*, but not the ſame *with us*. The ſecond *rock* he falls on is, that by this his interpretation, he muſt contrary to the Apoſtle grant, they did all (good and bad, worthy and unworthy) really and truly partake of Chriſt, who was truly according to Mr. *Spencer*, this ſpiritual rock and drink. Whereas the Apoſtle means they did all partake of Chriſt Sacramentally: Fathers alſo and their own Commentators grant it ſpoken of the material rock; but becauſe of the ſacramental relation, which that rock, and the water flowing from it to ſerve the whole Congregation, had to Chriſt, and that

which

which flowed from him, it is called a *ſpiritual rock*, and by a figure called Chriſt.

XXI. Mr. *Spencer* Rule for underſtanding ſpeeches in Scripture, figuratively or literally, examined.

But in producing figurative ſpeeches, he binds us to this condition: that if we will bring any thing againſt them, it muſt be ſuch a propoſition, that may poſſibly be verified in a proper ſenſe, and yet muſt be underſtood figuratively; whereas the proteſtants produce propoſitions that cannot poſſibly be underſtood in a real and proper ſenſe, as *this is my body* may, *pa.* 299. But may not *Manna* or *Rock* be by the omnipotency of God turned into fleſh as well as *Bread?* or the *water* that came out of the *rock* into *blood*, as well as wine may? For that propoſition; this is my body is ſo far from being *connaturally to be underſtood in a proper ſenſe* as he boldly affirms there, that it cannot poſſibly be ſo underſtood without the engaging of omnipotency to make ſuch a change of the ſubject *bread*, and therefore they are ſtill fain to fly to Gods omnipotency to make this *proper ſenſe* of theirs good: but why cannot propoſitions, which poſſibly can be underſtood in a proper ſenſe be rather figuratively taken? *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *the words of Scripture and alſo of other Authors, muſt be underſtood properly when they can be underſtood ſo:* or *when nothing compels to the contrary.* This reaſon

reason is good, but misapplied to *this is my body*: for it is one thing to say *can be so understood*, another to say can possibly be so understood; taking in all the wayes of possibility and omnipotency, without which that proposition, *this is my body*, cannot be possibly understood in a proper sense; for many things, yea circumstances *may compel us to the contrary*, and *hinder us from taking it in a proper sense*, beside absolute impossibility: else should we multiply miracles in Scripture, and be still offending against the rule of reason, that forbids us to conclude *à possibili ad esse*, the thing to *be so indeed*, because it is *possible* to be made so. The Scripture saying *all flesh is grass*, saith or might say, of every man, *this is grass*: and it is as possible for omnipotence to turn it into *grass*, as the bread into Christs body, must we therefore so understand it in a real proper sense? So when God said of *Adam thou art dust* — so when *David* said of the water of *Bethlem*, *this the blood of these men*, 2 Sam. 23. 17. Romanists that say the wine is turned into Christs blood, must say that water could be turned into their blood, and therefore possibly verified in a proper sense; but those about *David* understood the figurative sense of it.

Did

Did nothing elſe *compel us to the contrary*, (that is, not to underſtand theſe propoſitions in a proper ſenſe) but the engaging of omnipotencie to work ſo miraculouſly to make it good, it were enough. For when he works ſo, he tells us plainly of it, or at leaſt gives us the evidence of ſenſe for the change; neither of which we have for underſtanding *this is my body* in the *Romiſh* proper ſenſe. Then to impoſe upon Scripture ſuch a ſenſe when the ſpeech will bear another more agreeable to the purpoſe of the place, and to impoſe upon omnipotencie a neceſſitie of making it good, what is it but to tempt God? And here we may mind him again of the other propoſition, *this cup is the new Teſtament in my blood*, which we found him above loath to ſpeak to, but deſire him here to examine whether this Scripture can be taken in a literal proper ſenſe? He can not ſay it, *many things compel to the contrary*: then is it a figurative ſpeech, and that in the words of inſtitution, as well as *this is my body*.

The laſt objection is from *Jo. 6.* the *Capernaites* conceit of eating our Saviours fleſh, and his ſaying, *the fleſh profiteth nothing*: ſome indeed will apply this againſt the Romiſh doctrine: but I will not quarrel with him about the force of it.

The

The Protestant doctrine rests not upon this place of Scipture, we say the true flesh of Christ profiteth where ever it is really given and received, or eaten; and let the Romanists consider whether they must not say, the *flesh of Christ profiteth nothing*, when they say the wicked really eat the true flesh of Christ. It is plain by what our Saviour saith in that Chapter of *eating his flesh*, that albeit the Sacramental eating of his flesh may profit nothing as in them that receive unworthily; yet is there no real eating of our Saviours flesh, but what profiteth. St. *Paul* might say, *He that eateth that bread unworthily*, but could not say, *he that eateth Christs flesh unworthily*: taking it not for the bare Sacramental eating, but for real participation of his very flesh; which the *Romanists* allow unto the wicked. The cause of this and many more and greater incongruities, is that gross kind *of Real Presence*, which puts our Saviours body in stead of the substantial bread, fixing it under those *species* or qualities of bread, making it *unum quid* (as we noted above) *one thing with them*; and so carryed whither soever they are, given to whom soever, and received by whomsoever they are.

Having

Having done with these objections, which he calls the chief arguments of Protestants from *Scripture*; he tells us there are other drawn from *Natural Reason*, fitter for *Heathens* then *Christians*, p. 306. If we do but speak the horrid inconveniences, and indignities that the blessed and glorious body of our Saviour is, or may be exposed to by this gross way of presence or binding his body under & to the species: they presently cry this is fitter to be spoken by *Infidels* then *Christians*: we may not so much as utter the ill consequences of their belief without note of infidelity. So if inquiring a Reason of this their belief: (and not finding in Scripture any express witness of Gods will, nor any example of the like conversion, but finding many things, *that compel to the contrary*, from the reason of a body and of a Sacrament:) we profess that we cannot see how it should be, and that we have no reason to make it an Article of our belief: then are such arguments or questionings of it fitter for *Heathens* then *Christians*; so unwilling is that Church to have any thing questioned or searched into, that it propounds as Article of Faith. St. *Chrysostome*, speaking of that questioning of the Resurrection, 1 *Cor.* 15. 35. *how are the dead raised, and with what*

XII. Considerations of Transubstantiation, as to natural reason.

body do they come, saith, Τὸ πῶς ζητεῖν τὸ μὴ πιστεύοντος: *To be asking still how shall this be, is the part of one that believes not*; and it was well said, supposing the Article or thing to be believed, clearly expressed in Scripture, as the Resurrection of the dead, Incarnation, Birth of our Saviour and the like: when God Almighty has expressly declared these, then to ask *how this shall be*, sounds unbelief, its more fit for a *Heathen* then *Christian*: & therefore we believing the Sacrament is his body and blood, or as S. *Paul*, the communication of his *body* & *blood*, and consequently his *body* and *blood* really present in the Sacrament, we do not question nor define the *Modus*, how this is done; but challenge the boldness of the Church of Rome, that has determined the *Modus* by *transubstantiation* (that is, by destroying one essential part of the Sacrament, the outward Element, Bread and Wine) and would impose this upon the world, as an Article of Faith.

These arguments from Reason (as he calls them) he will undertake to answer, and because he deals with such as profess themselves to be Christians, he will endeavour it, by *giving clear instances in some Article of Christian faith, which they believe wherein they must solve the like difficulties*

fenities, to those they urge from natural Reason against this mystery, p. 306. This is fair, and will be satisfactory, if he can make it good. But still we must remember, if he could make it good, it evinces but the possibility of the thing, which is needless in this point to contend much about, and does acknowledge a needless multiplying of miracles and engaging of Gods omnipotency, where he has made no express declaration of his will or evidence of the thing. The Arguments, as he calls them, are propounded here by way of *question*, and he answers by other questions; which binds him to see to it, that there be no *disparity* between the reason of the one and of the other; or that *the like difficulty* (as he undertook above) must be solved in that Instance he gives. But this is not likely to be done, if we observe the doubts proceed upon our Saviours body considered not onely simply in it self, or nature of a body, but also as concerned in this business, in the nature of a Sacrament; also if we observe his way of proceeding, for he is fain still to serve himself of the capacity of a spirit, as *Soul*, *Angel*, *God* himself, to shew the possible conditions a *Body* may be put under: or of the mystery of the *hypostatical union*, to shew the like supply of de-

fects in nature here; now this at first sight presents a great *disparity* between the things.

XXIII. Accidents without a subject.

The first question enquires, how can Accidents (the species of bread and wine) exist without a subject.

This question, although we will not dispute it to the denying of Gods omnipotency in sustaining Accidents without a Subject; yet may it be put to the prejudice of Romish Transubstantiation many wayes. First, because it implies a needless multiplying of miracles in the Sacrament; Secondly, because it binds the body and blood of Christ to and under those Accidents or Species, upon which many inconveniences follow; Mr. *Spencers* answering this question by the humane nature in Christ, which subsists without its proper personality, and receives it from the divine nature, must suppose that Christs body and blood in the Eucharist does supply the defect of the proper subject of those species: * *Bellarm.* makes them and Christs body *Unum quid* as it were one and the same thing, † *Greg. de Val.* proves, *Christ and those Accidents to be truly, properly, formally united*: From hence as I said many inconveniences follow,

* *Bell.* l. 4. de *Eucha.* c. 29. Sect. sed hæc.

† *Valen* disput. 6. in 3. Tho. punct. 1. Sect. 19. *Christum & illa accidentia in Eucharistia, vere, proprie, formaliter inter se uniri.*

follow, for what happens to the ſpecies, muſt alſo to the body and blood of Chriſt. Thirdly, if we conſider this with reference to the Sacrament, we may well put the queſtion, how can Accidents of bread and wine be in the Sacrament without their proper ſubject, how can they ſupply the purpoſes of the Sacrament (as to the outward part of it) without the ſubſtances of bread and wine? or if the body and blood of Chriſt under the ſpecies muſt ſupply the defect of their proper ſubject or ſubſtances (as his anſwering by the perſonality of our Saviour muſt imply) then muſt the body and blood of Chriſt ſupply the place and property of the outward part of the Sacrament which is moſt abſurd: By this of the Perſonality of our Saviour he ſerves himſelf in anſwering the eight queſtion, and the three laſt; But the diſparity is evident, for the perſonality of the divine nature may ſupply the defect of it in the humane, by reaſon of the hypoſtatical union which joyns the humane nature to the divine: But the body and blood of Chriſt can neither be united to the ſpecies of bread and wine in ſuch a manner as to make it ſupply the defect of their proper ſubject, neither is apt to ſupply the properties of that ſubject or outward element of the

Sacrament as we noted above: yet does Mr. *Spencer* by his answer suppose the body and blood of our Saviour, to supply all—— and the Romish writers by that strict union, which they suppose to be between his body and the Species, make it subject to many inconveniences.

XXIIII. Same body in several places.

To the question, how can the same body be in several places at once? he returns this question as satisfactory, how can the *Soul*, or an *Angel*, or *God* be at the same time in many places? But any one may see the disparity between the properties and condition of a *Body* and of a *Spirit* and consequently the unsatisfactorines of his Answer. Nor is it true which he here must suppose, that a Soul can be in several bodies distant one from other, or an Angel in distant places at once: therefore they are forced to take in Gods property of being present in many places: Mr. *Spencer* learnt it of the *Cardinal*, affirming the body of Christ *to be in place as God is.*

l. 3. c. 4. de Euchar. *quomodo Deus est in Loco.*

XXV. Penetration of Dimensions.

To that of Penetration of parts, if our Saviours body should be contained in the least part or crumb of the host, he answers by our Saviours body passing through *the doors*, and through his mothers *womb*, both being shut. But its no where said they remained absolutely shut,

shut, * *Durand* shews how with more reason it may be said, our Saviour came in, the *doors* opening to him, unperceived by his Disciples; for it is not said (saith he) that he came in, *per januas clausas* but *januis clausis*, not *through the shut doors*, but *the doors being shut*. And for his passage through his Mothers *womb* it being *shut*, the Scripture puts him among *the first born that opened the womb*, and though the Fathers often speak of *the womb being shut*, yet is it only to deny such an *opening* of the womb as is injurious to her Virginity, and much to this purpose *Durand* shews (in the place above cited) may be said of our Saviours coming out of the womb, citing Saint *Aug. Ambr. Greg.*

* *in 4. sent. dist. in 44. qu. 6.*

Another objection p. 308. *If our Saviours flesh and blood be really in the Sacrament, then may Catts and Rats eat it:* This objection is not carefully expressed, for such inconveniences do not follow upon a Real presence, but such a Presence as the Romanists fancy, which binds his body and blood to the species, and so makes it liable to all the indignities which happen to them. But see how he would answer it, by the like as he supposes. *If the flesh and blood of Christ* (saith he) *were really in the Passion,*

"XXVI. Our Saviours body exposed to indignities

then might dogs eat his blood that was shed. As if it were alike what was done to his passible body (appointed then to suffer) and done now to his glorious body: All the disgraces and indignities, that were done or could happen unto him then, were agreeable to the work he came about, *viz.* to redeem us by suffering; and whatever became of that precious blood that was shed, it had notwithstanding its due effect for our Redemption; but now to expose his glorious body to such indignities (as they do by uniting it so to the species) does not beseem Christians.

XXVII. Multiplying of miracles needlesly.

The next objection or question: *If there were so many miracles as you must hold wrought in the Sacrament, why are none of them seen?* He answers by another question, *If there be so many miracles wrought in the incarnation of our Saviour, why were none of them seen?* p. 309. But great disparity here: for albeit the miraculous Incarnation of our Saviour was secret and unseen in the *working* of it, yet seen and apparent enough in the effect wrought. Again the nature of that mystery required it should be secret in the working, but for our believing it, the word doth sufficiently attest it, and the thing or work wrought was sufficiently evident,

evident, therefore S. *Jo.* saith c. 1. 14. *The word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory*, &c. Nothing like in the sacrament, notwithstanding that the nature of sacraments, requires all be done to the sense for confirmation: and as nothing appears of all the supposed miracles, so nor does the word of God plainly attest any of them, so destitute is their way of Transubstantiation of any just proof or evidence.

CHAP. VIII.

Against Communion in one kinde.

THe Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, delivered in the Council of *Trent*, and here prefixed by Mr. *Spencer*, carries its Condemnation in the forehead: acknowledging, that our Saviour instituted, and administred in both kinds, and that the use of both kinds was *frequent* (might have said *Constant*) in the beginning of Christian Religion (might *have said*, for 1200. years after the beginning of Christian Religion) yet is not ashamed to approve the contrary practice: and to

I. The boldness of the Church of *Rome* in this point.

plead for it an authority in the Church, about the Sacraments, to make a change *Salvâ ſubſtantia*, that is, the ſubſtance being preſerved entire; where again it ſpeaks its own condemnation; for how can the ſubſtance be preſerved, when half of that which our Saviour made the Sacrament is denied to the people. He calls this (half Communion) the ſequel of the former Article, *of Real preſence*: and acknowledges, that without the eſtabliſhing of the one the other cannot be defended, ſo *p.* 322, 323. We ſee then what goodly fruit the *Romiſh* Real Preſence has brought forth, to the great and juſt offence of Chriſtian people, in denying them the Cup: beſides other goodly *ſequels* of it, as *Adoration*, and *Circumgeſtation*. It is not *Real Preſence* truly granted (no not ſuch as the *Romaniſts* will acknowledge to be true) that gives a ground for half Communion, or makes it defenſible; for they grant as we ſee here *p.* 123. *the Lutherans* convinced of this myſtery, *i. e.* to believe a *true Real Preſence*; but cannot ſay they are convinced of this *ſequel*, or that it follows, then may the Communion be delivered in one kind, there being other Reaſons from the *Inſtitution* of this Sacrament, and our

Saviours

Saviours *purpose* therein, which forbid it; as we shall see by what follows.

To the first Argument from the Institution, which is carefully to be observed, he answers: I. that the *accidentary circumstances* of the first institution are to be distinguished from the substance and essence of the Sacrament; *This is always to be held*, not the former, *p.* 324. This we admit; only note, he reckons the giving it then to Priests only, among the accidentary circumstances of the first institution; II. he answers: that the entire substance of the Sacrament is under each kinde; he means both body and blood are under each kinde; we shall see afterward how farr that is true. But be it so, that both body and blood are under each; yet is not that the whole *substance* of the Sacrament, which stands in the *outward* part (Bread and Wine) as well as the *inward* or spiritual part, the body and blood; nor is the *Institution* held to, if the body and blood be given but in one kinde. And notwithstanding that he reckoned, the giving it at first *to Priests only*, among the *Accidentary circumstances* of the Institution, here he tells us: *All that can be gathered from the bare words of Institution is*, that it is to be *consecrated and received by Priests*,

II. Halfe Communion against the Institution.

(*Mr.*

(*Mr.* Spencer *may say what he will*; and yet adde a greater untruth) *such as were the Apostles*, who *were then made Priests*, p. 325. If *then made Priests*, let him shew us what words, what imposition of hands or other Ceremonies were there for that purpose? Was our Saviour then *conferring orders*, or instituting the Eucharist? or could he with the same words, actions, and ceremonies, institute and administer two several Sacraments? *Do this*, he said, and that is all they can pretend to: but if by this the Disciples were made Priests, then they *doing* what our Saviour did, must also ordain others so oft as they administer the Eucharist: Now the whole importance of that precept (*Do this*) concerns the whole company, Priest and people; as is plain by 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26. And it is generally held by the Ancients, that the Disciples then represented the whole Church, or company of faithfull: and that they received orders, or Priesthood after his resurrection, *Jo.* 20. 22. Lastly, the Church of *Rome* gives not the Sacrament in both kinds to Priests, when they are not *Conficientes*, consecrators or administers of it, as the Disciples then were not; but leaving this senseless assertion and novel device (of our Saviours making them Priests when he

be ſaid, *do this*) let us come to the main, viz. *the whole ſubſtance of the Sacrament under each kind.*

III. Whether the whole ſubſtance of the Sacrament be in one kinde.

He that receives under one kinde (ſaith Mr. *Spencer*) *receives a true Sacrament*, p. 326. He that receives (may we ſay) according to the *Romiſh* Church in one kinde, he does not receive a true Sacrament, or not the true Sacrament, becauſe not the outward part truly and wholly as it was purpoſed and appointed at the Inſtitution; ſo that definition which he gives here, may paſs for a compleat definition of a Sacrament in general, but is not compleatly uſed, when applied only to one of the kinds or outward parts of this Sacrament; For there is (as he noted p. 324.) ſomething particular in this Sacrament, (not the particular he there notes, that *the whole ſubſtance* may be received in each kinde, but) that it ſtands in two kinds, or ſigns or outward Elements; both which together make the *compleat* ſign of the ſpiritual grace, ſignified and exhibited in this Sacrament; each ſigne apart cannot repreſent and exhibit the whole ſpiritual grace of this Sacrament.

He

A different grace conferred in each kinde.

He acknowledges a *different grace* conferred here, one of ſpiritual meat, the other of ſpiritual drink: only he will have both in each kinde *p.* 327. Which is as much as to ſay; the effect of drink is ſhewen and exhibited by the meat we eat: and the effect of meat, by the drink we take: ſo with equal abſurdity to ſay, that the blood ſhed is ſhewen by the blood in the Veins or unſhed (for ſo its given with the body under one kinde) and that the blood is drunk when we eat the fleſh. For though it be true, that he who receives Chriſt by faith, receives whole Chriſt, and by that mouth of faith eats his fleſh and drinks his blood, is really made partaker of his body given, and his blood ſhed for him: thus without the Sacrament; and when we come to receive him in the Sacrament, the ſame act of faith receiving him in one kinde (as under the *bread*) can and doth at the ſame time receive alſo his blood; or *whole Chriſt*: yet does he not receive his blood *ſacramentally*, as blood ſhed, and ſo not *all of Chriſt*, or Chriſt *wholly*. Thus by reaſon of the act of faith, he that receives but in one kinde out of *neceſſity*, may be aſſured that he is not defrauded of the participation of Chriſts blood ſhed; but he cannot be ſo aſſured, that wilfully re-

Totum Chriſtum, not *Totum Chriſti*.

ceives

ceives but in one kinde: becauſe though there is a concomitancy of fleſh and blood in Chriſts body, as to the natural condition of it, yet not a concomitancy of his fleſh and *bloodſhed*, as to the Sacramental conſideration of them, which therefore are ſet out in the Sacrament apart by two ſeveral elements; Alſo becauſe ſuch a one being a Tranſgreſſor of our Saviours Inſtitution, and enemy to his own comfort, falls ſhort of the benefit thereof. Therefore the *Church of England* had cauſe to ſay (though not to the purpoſe he would have it, *p.* 326.) in the diſtribution of the bread. *The body of our Lord—preſerve thy*—and then adding the Cup, to ſay there alſo, *preſerve thy*— and this conformably, as to our Saviours Inſtitution, ſo to his ſaying, *Except ye eat—and drink—Jo.* 6. 53. and to the Apoſtle, in what he received from the Lord, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28.

IIII. The *Romiſh* Sacrifice wrong to Chriſt Sacrament.

This Author is forced to confeſs that *if by a compleat ſign be meant a full and expreſs repreſentation of the two particulars, (the ſpiritual meat and ſpiritual drink,* which he granted to be a different grace) *then under one kinde there is not a compleat ſigne of both. But it muſt be proved* (ſaith he) *that the ſubſtance of this ſacrifice, requires they ſhould be alwayes ſo fully repreſented*

sented in each particular communion of the people: why needs it such proof if we look into the institution of this Sacrament? his reason is, *because the full representation under both kinds is exhibited unto Lay Christians, by the consecration and communion of the Priest in the dreadful sacrifice of the Mass*, p. 327. But what have we to do here with their sacrifice of Mass? or to enquire what is required to such a Sacrifice? We are treating of the Communion or Sacrament, which our Saviour instituted for all Christians and to such purposes; and that cannot be compleat except *administred* in both: no more then their sacrifice can be compleat, unless *consecrated* in both. For it is senseless to think the sacrifice must be mutilate, unless the Priest consecrate and receive it in both, and yet the Sacrament not mutilate, though the people receive it but in one kinde; and senseless to hold or call it (as he doth) a *Communion*, when the Priest receives it alone. But having turned the *Sacrament* into such a *Sacrifice*, they take off the people from seeking the benefit of Christs blood shed in the Sacrament to seek it, and be content to have it applied to them in their pretended sacrifice: where they are only spectators. This however more profita-

ble

le to the Priests, I am sure it is little to he Peoples advantage.

But when this sacrifice, which they pre-end to be real and properly propitiatory, omes to be driven home, it interfeirs so njuriously and unhandsomely with that rue and onely propitiatory sacrifice on he Cross, that they are fain to take up, with making it the *application* of that sa-rifice on the Cross: which we say is the work and purpose of a Sacrament, viz. to *apply* a sacrifice and make men from time o time partakers of that which was made or offered but once; And such is the in-ent & purpose of this Sacrament to apply hat sacrifice of the Cross unto us and for his respect also it is alwayes requisite that in this Sacrament or Communion, there should be a full representation and exhi-bition made in both kinds, not only of his body broken, but of his blood shed also.

His Instance of *thrice dipping* in baptism for a full expression of the Trinity, where-as Protestants acknowledge once dipping sufficient, is far from concluding one kinde in this Sacrament to be a *full ex-pression* of what is signified, or a *sufficient exhibition* of what is to be received there: That Ceremony of thrice dipping, or that purpose of representing thereby the mystery

V. His impertinent instance in Baptisme.

mystery of the Trinity, was not of our Saviours institution, but a practice taken up in the Church, and not universal.

But he goes on, or rather urges again what he had said. *If our Saviour* instituted each species or kinde apart, to confer saving grace, then he which receives either kinde devoutly, receives that *grace for which he instituted it*, p. 329. But this is cunning through ambiguous expressions. For our Saviour instituted each *apart*, that is, *several* or one after the other, but not that one therefore should be received without the other. Or if this *apart*, belongs to *confer*, it is true that our Saviour did institute each to confer (and he that receives devoutly does in each receive) the grace for which he instituted that kind or part: but does not receive the whole grace for which he instituted the Sacrament. Also he that receives the one kind or part, devoutly in order and with respect to the other, he receives the grace for which it was instituted: but he cannot assure himself of receiving that grace who receives the one *exclusively* to the other; for how shall he be partaker of Christs bloodshed in the Sacrament, or as it is represented, held out and exhibited in the Sacrament, that

will only receive that kinde or part, which gives him the body to eat, not that *bloodshed* to drink it?

I have been the longer upon his first Assay; becauſe what is already ſaid will meet with moſt of his ſophiſtical Replyes. As when to the next objection *p.* 330. *that the Prieſt is obliged to receive the Cup notwithſtanding, that according to the Romiſh Tenet*, he had received a true Sacrament *in the Hoſt*: He anſwers by their being Prieſts, and by the reaſon of a ſacrifice; upon which double account, he will have the Prieſt obliged to both, not Lay people. This appears vain by what was ſaid above Num. II. & IIII. VI.

So to the following objection, taken from the *compleat Refection* by meat and drink: He anſwers as he ſaid above, that both the graces of ſpiritual meat and ſpiritual drink, or *grace ſufficient to ſalvation*, is conferred in each kinde: and *All that can be gathered from this objection is only that our Saviour in the firſt Inſtitution gave a moſt plentifull and abundant banquet, whereof each part was ſufficient to confer life*, p. 332, 333. Now albeit in a plentifull feaſt many diſhes might be taken away; yet none can ſay it is either a plentiful or ſufficient feaſt and Refection: if drink be wholly denied. And conſidering A compleat refection intended in the Sacrament.

ring what our Saviour purposed by the Sacrament (which he made *sanguinis fusi*, of his blood shed, and that of the *New Testament*) it must needs be his intention that both should alwayes be received: nor finally does one confer the saving grace (as was said above) if the other be wilfully neglected. His pretence from *Joh.* 6. 57. *He that eateth me shall live by me*, to prove the sufficiency of receiving in one kinde, is inconsequent: for the verses before, 53, 54, 56. shew one as needful as the other; As when it is said, *He that repents and believes* shall be saved: both are set down as necessary, and we may not conclude, because we meet sometimes with one only mentioned, as *Jo.* 6. *v.* 47. *He that believeth hath everlasting life*: therefore this without the other is sufficient. Faith (as above said) by the same act of believing eats his flesh and drinks his blood, *extra Sacramentum*, out of the Sacrament; but if we come to do this in the Sacrament (that is, by faith there to partake of his body and blood) the eating and drinking must be distinct acts, according to the Sacramental way of participation: for so his *blood shed* is not drunk in the eating of his flesh.

And

And therefore the people are deceived, hile they are borne in hand, that *by re-ving in one kinde, they are not deprived y grace neceſſary to ſalvation.* (as he 334.) For that Church as much as in it es, does deprive them of the benefit of hriſts blood ſhed in this Sacrament; nd however it pleaſe God to deal in ercy with the poor abuſed people: yet o man can aſſure himſelf of receiving he grace of this Sacrament, that doth ilfully neglect and refuſe to receive it, s our Saviour inſtituted and appointed . But ſee how he would ſtop the peo-les mouths in the cloſe of this point, by elling them, that albeit they *want the xtent of grace*, which *Prieſts have by re-eiving in both kinds, yet they have ſuffi-ient: and that they are obliged to have reſpect, not only to their own ſpiritual pro-it in the encreaſe of grace by this Sacra-ent*: but alſo, *to the reverence due unto , and muſt be content to want that en-reaſe, when it cannot be obtained but by me irreverence offered to this divine Sa-rament*, p. 335. As if our Saviour in-ending the participation of his blood hed, and *bidding all to drink thereof*, ould not or did not foreſee, what incon-enience would or might happen upon the bſerving of what he appointed: and as

if

if the greatest irreverence, were not dis-
obedience: and obedience to his wil
the greatest Reverence. But the Rev-
rence and honour of the Priest is here-
provided for among them, and the peop
must be content with a mutilate and i
compleat Sacrament.

VII. All commanded to drink of the Cup.

The next argument is from the Prece
Drink ye all of this, p. 341. where h
pittifully shuffles, running backward an
forward to evade the force of it. First h
would have it no command: notwith-
standing that the speech is plainly impe-
rative, as well as the other, *Do this*, u
which they place a strict command. Hi
instances of like speeches will appear im-
pertinent, if compared with this: as *Ye*
13. 14. *Ye ought to wash*— the speech i
not imperative, but indicative, of a duty
taught them by that action or example o
our Saviours washing their feet, *viz.* th
duty of *humility*: not binding them to
that very action or expression by wash-
ing, as this precept of *drinking* doth,
and needs must binde all who come to re-
ceive, and when they come. Now that o
Mat. 26. 26. *Take*, though it doth not
absolutely command the *Mode*, or man-
ner of taking it in the hand (he aimed in
this instance at the Priests putting it into
their mouths) yet doth it peremptorily
command

ὀφείλετε *ye ought.*

ommand a taking which amounts to a *eiving*; this is the ſubſtance or neceſſa- requiſite of the Sacrament, the other *hand* or by *mouth* immediately, is but the mode or circumſtance.

Again, being loath to have it a com- and: *The words* (ſaith he) *of them- ſelves cannot import a command, but may ſignify only a bare invitation:* as when *ſay to a Gueſt, ſit down, eat,* and *drink thus* or *that*, p. 334. But he ſhould have conſidered, that if they may ſignify only *bare invitation*, then the one as well as other, and both of them (the *eating* and *drinkng*) may be refuſed: and ſo the Sa- crament left free for every one to receive or not to receive it at all, which below he will deny. Again, though it be but manners among men, to leave a Gueſt at his liberty, and therefore ſuch words im- ply a freedome left them, do not impoſe a neceſſity, or duty, as this ordaining of this Sacrament doth: where it is our du- ty by *drinking* and *eating*, and doing ſo as at firſt was done, to remember and ſhew forth our Saviours death: and with- all it is our great and neceſſary concern- ment, to receive the benefit there offered. And yet you uſe not the people ſo kindly as a man that makes a feaſt, doth his gueſt: for dare you thus invite the people, and give

give them the freedom to *eat* and *drink*? does not the Prieſt notwithſtanding thoſe words of Invitation, eat and drink up all himſelf, in the celebration of the Maſs, the people looking on only? Nay is not this *Invitation* come to a plain *Interdict*, a forbidding of the people to receive the Cup? *Drink ye all of this*, ſaith our Saviour; ye ſhall *not drink* of this, ſaith the Church of *Rome*. I might adde, is not this a mocking of the people? nay is it not a mocking of Almighty God, when in a prayer of the Canon of the Maſs, it is ſaid by the Prieſt (according to the ancient practiſe) *quotquot ſumpſerimus*— implying that others have received with the Prieſt and in both kinds, whereas none do nor are ſuffered to do.

At length Mr. *Spencer* yeilds a command given in thoſe words, *Drink ye all of this*: but given *to the Apoſtles only, and extendible to Biſhops and Prieſts*: But why to them and no farther? here he ſeems to refer the meaning and Extent of ſuch Commands given without Limitation, to the practice and perpetual tradition of the Church, *p.* 344, 345. We deny not, but that is a good direction for underſtanding matters of practice; and in this point we affirm, and are ſure the practice and perpetual Tradition of the Church for

for above 12. hundred years is againſt this *Romiſh* innovation: And we are ſure, that Antiquity is againſt them, as concerning the *Capacity* of thoſe perſons to whom the Sacrament was firſt given, and who were then *bidden all of them to drink*; which muſt therefore be *extendible not only* to *Biſhops* and *Prieſts*, but to all faithfull Chriſtians, who were then repreſented in thoſe firſt perſons.

VIII. Do this, concerns all preſent.

Now as for the other Precept, *Do this in remembrance of me*, he will have a ſtrict command in thoſe words, ſo far as concerns the Prieſt, to *bleſs*, *conſecrate*, *offer*, *adminiſter*, 346. But its plain the Prieſt doth not as our Saviour did, for he does not *adminiſter* ſo oft as he *conſecrates*; and when he does *adminiſter* it is not in both kinds as our Saviour did: Again if the Prieſt be hereby bound to *adminiſter*, is not the people conſequently bound to *receive*? He is not willing to grant it yet, but ſhall below; here he makes inſtance in *Prieſthood* and *marriage*, which they are *bound to adminiſter, when juſtly required to do it, yet is no man bound to receive the one or the other*, 347. It is ſtill the hap of his Inſtances to be impertinent: for he himſelf acknowledges a little below, the diſparity between receiving of Prieſthood or Marrioge, and the receiving of

the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour under both kinds; the disparity I say between them as to this point of freedome: for first, though no man be bound to receive Priesthood or Marriage, yet is neither the one or other ever conferred, but when some are to receive them. Secondly, let these pass for the present as Sacraments: yet is it very inconsequent, from the liberty in receiving these, which concern the particular estates of men, to argue for like freedom in receiving that Sacrament, which concerns the salvation of all Christians; or from the free choice of a particular profession or state, to conclude an indifferency in the duty of our general profession or calling, as we are Christians: the duties of which profession, are incumbent on us in order to our salvation.

The obligation of that precept, upon particular persons.

Again he replies; That command may be answered by saying, *It is a precept given to the Church in general*, that what *our Saviour here commands be done*, p. 346. We have heard of an *implicit faith*, but here is an *implicit receiving*; so it be done in the Church, the command is performed; as if every Christian in particular, were not concerned in the purpose of this Sacrament, or could live by another man's

mans eating and drinking. At length perſwaded by S. *Thomas* his authority, (he would not by S, *Pauls* alone) to apply the *do this*, both to the *Hoſt*, and the Cup, and to admit a precept in it for the laity, to receive this Sacrament: he betakes himſelf to the uſual refuge; They ſatisfy the precept of eating and drinking if they receive it in either, *p.* 148, 149. that is, they drink the Cup, if they eat the Bread. His S. *Thomas* his invention of concomitancy will not ſalve this, nor can the Reader be ſatisfied with the *faſt and looſe*, this Author ſo often playes in anſwering to the precept, *Do this.*

The order he ſpeaks of, *preſcribed by holy Church, now ordaining both to be received, now but one:* and *to ſome the Hoſt to others the Calice only*: doth no where appear, but in the late orders of the *Romiſh* Church. In the ancient Church (though ſometimes in caſes of neceſſity, one part might be adminiſtred privately) never were ſuch *Orders* made: nor ſuch practice uſed publickly, ſolemnly, or when both could be adminiſtred.

To *Joh.* 6. 53. *Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood*: he anſwers. It is *a general command* given to the generality of Chriſtians, to *receive his body by way of eating, and his blood by*

way of drinking: and to every particular Christian to concurr to the execution of this command: not *that every one in particular is obliged to do both, but that some eating some drinking, others doing both, each particular confers to the performance of the Command*, p. 351. Thus the body and blood shed, are with them received in either kind by virtue of their *concomitance*, and the command of eating and drinking is satisfied and performed by vertue of *Concurrence*, every person conferring to the performance of it. This is Implicit receiving; so both be *done among you* it is sufficient, when as our Saviour layes both upon every *particular* person, and so repeats it in the *singular*, He that *eateth*— and *drinketh*, v. 54, 58. and that in order to *his having life in him*; His instancing in the precept *to teach and baptize all Nations*, *Mat.* 28. not binding *each of the Apostles in particular to teach and baptize the whole world*, 352. has the fate of all his instances, to be impertinent; for it runs upon the *extent* of the object only, (*the whole world*) which implyed an impossibility, not upon the *exercise* of the whole duty or office, which did not admit a liberty of forbearing either act of preaching or baptizing. For

as

as the obligation in the Sacrament is to eating and drinking, ſo there to a double act of their office, Teaching and Baptizing, That Apoſtle that would ſet down with doing one of them only, ſhould not do his duty.

It is objected *p.* 356. If it be given ſo to the Church in general, then may the command be ſatisfied and performed, ſo be it the Church provides certain perſons to receive, and exempt all the reſt. In his anſwers to this, we may ſee the giddineſs of mans brain, when ſet againſt the apparent Truth of Gods word: *If we take the ſenſe* (ſaith he) *according to the common ſtrein of Doctors, every particular will be obliged by the words— (except ye eat and—) eſpecially ſeeing that S.* Paul *extends this matter of Communion to each particular.* This is one Truth he ſo much *ſtreined* againſt above, notwithſtanding thoſe Doctors, and S. *Paul*: that every particular man is obliged— but how? and to what? to *eat* and *drink*— thats expreſs both in 6. of *Joh.* and 1 *Cor.* 11. *but disjunctively* (as he ſaith elſwhere, *p.* 350.) that is, to eat *or* drink: Heer's the giddineſs and vanity of wilfull error, —to make alimitation or gloſs clean contrary to the text, for our Saviours words

1 Cor. 11.

oblige to these acts *conjunctively*, eat— and drink— thrice in *Joh.* 6. and the Apostle Saint *Paul*, thrice conjunctively eat— and drink 1 *Cor.* 11.

Secondly, in answer to the former objection, he grants *it was not in the power of the Apostles to exempt any of the Twelve from concurring to the conversion of the Nations*, p. 356. If he will have this pertinent, he should adde; but it was in their power to exempt some of the Twelve, from doing the whole duty, or several acts enjoyned by our Saviour: that if one of them *taught* only, another baptized onely, and so all partially concurred to the performing our Saviours command, it had been sufficient: He will not surely say this: yet dare defend it in their Churches, exempting the people from the one part of duty enjoyned them by our Saviour: He subjoyns, *It is not in the Churches power to exempt any one from this precept, by having it performed of other Christians appointed by her Authority*, 357. Yet their Church takes power to exempt from one part (*drinking* his blood-shed) which lyes under the command and obligation, as well as the other of *eating*.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, he grants here another Truth, to the acknowledgment of his Impertinency above: where he instanced in the freedom of receiving Priesthood and Marriage, to imply a liberty of receiving, or not receiving the Cup, but here he grants this *Sacrament is not left free (as Marriage and Priesthood are) without a divine Precept* that every *Christian sometimes receive it*, p. 357. This is fair, but see the obstinacy still and giddiness of wilfull error: That eating only is sufficient, because our Saviour *when he expresses himself in the singular number attributes eternal life to it; He that eateth me shall live by me*, *Joh.* 6. 57. Nay, that the words (*je tu*— and *drink* v. 53.) *cannot include a necessity of both kinds to every particular person, without contradiction to this Text*, so he, p. 358, 359. As if one should reason, If it be true that *he who is born of the Spirit shall enter into the kingdome of heaven*, then cannot the Text *Joh.* 3. 5. *unless a man be born of water and Spirit*, include a necessity of both, —nor when the Scripture requires *Repent and believe Mar.* 1. that cannot include a necessity of both for the kingdome of heaven, without contradiction to the Text *Joh.* 3. *ult.* where one only is men-

tioned, and life attributed to it, *He that believeth in me hath everlasting life.*

Again, it may be said, that eating is sometimes mentioned alone in that chapter, as answerable to the occasion of the discourse, *Manna* and *bread from heaven* and as fit to set out the reception of faith, which at the same time also drinks his blood shed: so it did till the Sacrament was instituted, and so it still doth, *extra Sacramentum*, out of the Sacrament, but if we apply this to the receiving of Christ in the Sacrament, then *drinking* is as necessary, both to answer the whole act of Faith, and the whole purpose of the Sacrament, in participating his blood shed and receiving a full Refection: And therefore though eating only be expressed in that v. 57. yet he could not but see that our Saviour when he *spoke in the singular number*, mentions and enjoyns them both, v. 34, 36.

His instancing in the command about the *Passover*, enjoyning to *kill*, *roast*, *sprinkle* and *eat*, but not binding every one to perform all, but some one thing, some another, *p.* 361. proves as all his former impertinent; for the concernment here is in the reception or partaking of the Sacrament (of the Passover by eating, of the Eucharist,

Eucharist by eating and drinking:) and I hope, he will not deny but all and every one of the Israelites were bound to eat the passover, and to eat it as the Lord enjoyned it, under pain of being *cut off*, *Exod.* 12. Indeed if we take in all the actions to be done in and about the Sacrament of the Eucharist, those that concern the *consecration* and *administration*, as well as the *reception* of it: every one is not bound to perform all; but that which concerns the *Reception*, belongs to all; not to do all that our Saviour did, but all that the Disciples then did, belongs to all to do; because they then represented the whole company of the faithful.

He closes up this point and his whole discourse with some passion against Protestants — charging them with *an unworthy and base esteem of the most sacred body and blood of our Saviour: not thinking that either of them* (as they are in this Sacrament) *is fit to confer saving grace to such as devoutly receive them* — p. 363. Thus where Argument and Reason is wanting, there Passion must make it out; But as to the worth and power of our Saviours body and blood, we acknowledge it* above, and the fitness of either to confer sufficient grace, and how it does

* See No. 3. & 5.

when in case of necessity the one is *devoutly* received: but we question how they that wilfully refuse one of them (the blood shed) can be said *devoutly* to receive, or can expect that sufficient grace, which is given in the Sacrament to them, that receive it according to our Saviours Institution. It is not any derogating from the worth of our Saviours body and blood, but a due regard to his Will and Command that causes us to stand upon receiving both: What he adds runs still upon that Assertion (*that there is not any expres's command given in Scripture to all particular Christians to receive both*, pag. 365.) which we shewed above to be false— by our Saviours commands in his Institution of this Sacrament; *Drink ye all*, and *Do this*; by *what he severely denounced* Joh. 6. 53. by what S. *Paul* delivers as received from our Saviour; 1 *Cor.* 11. That which this Author immediately subjoyns, *and the custome of the Primitive, Ancient*, and *Modern Church is evidently to the contrary*: will appear to be far from Truth, as to the Primitive and Ancient Church, when we come to the survey of Antiquity in this point.

To

To conclude, I could wish that Mr. *Spencer*, who pretends he undertook this work for no other end then to inform the *misled spirits of this age*, (as he tels us in the close of his book) would have a conscionable regard to an open and apparent Truth, which he contends against as in this, so other points of *Romish* doctrine; and that he would think of reducing those *misled spirits*, which he has drawn out of the way by such deceiving assertions as he has delivered in this Treatise, and bent all his wits to render them plausible to the Vulgar.

A Brief Survey of Antiquity, for the trial of the former points:

Whether they can, as held by the Church of Rome, *pass for* Catholick Doctrine.

SECT. I.

Vincentius Lirinensis gives us a safe Rule for trial of Points of faith and Catholick doctrine. *If any* (saith he) *would continue safe and sound in a sound faith, he ought two wayes to fortify his belief: First, by the Authority of Gods word* (or Scripture,) *then by the Tradition of the Catholick Church*: bringing down from age to age the known sense of that word. Then for the Tradition of the Church, it must be universal,

Introduction.

Duplici modo munire fidem suam debet, Primo divina legis authoritate, deinde Ecclesiæ Cath. Traditione, cap. 1.

versal, to prove it *Catholick Doctrine*:

Quod semper & ubique creditum—c. 3.

That is properly Catholick which was received or believed, every where (through all the Churches) *and alwayes*; (through every Age.)

According to this Rule we ought to direct the Tryal, and may justly expect, that the Church of *Rome* imposing these and many other points upon the World for *Catholick faith*, should give us them clearly proved by this Rule; whereas we finde them in these points pittifully destitute of *Scripture*, which is the first and main ground-work of faith. Yet because *Scripture* is *Scripture*, and by all Christians received for the word of God, and challenges the first place in the Rule of Faith: therefore they think themselves concerned to bring *Scripture* for every point: such as their best wits have found out any way capable of being wrested to their purpose: far from that clearness and force of proof which those places of Scripture have, that hold out unto us *matters of Faith*.

SECT.

SECT. I.

Of worshiping Angels and Saints.

HOw forsaken the *Romanists* are of Scripture here, may appear, by what could be alledged by Mr. *Spencer* in defence of it, as we saw above Cap. 1.) from the reverence given to the *Angels* by *Lot* and others; or to *men living*, as to *Elias* and *Elisha*— which proved impertinent, and fell short of that worship which the Church of *Rome* allows and practises. It is also confessed by some of them, * that this business of worshiping and Invocating Saints or Angels, is not expressed in the New Testament, and reason given for it, *because it would seem hard to the Jews, and give occasion to the Gentiles to think new Gods put upon them.*

I. Romanists here destitute of Scripture-proof.

* *Salmeron in 1 Tim. 2. disp. 8. Sect. postremo.*

As little help have they from the *Tradition of the Catholick Church*, or witness of *Antiquity*, which here runs with a full stream against them. And now for the Trial, we will first speak to the General,

Religious

Religious worship as incompetent to a Creature, though most excellent: such as Saints and Angels; the particulars of this worship, by *Invocation* and *Image-worship* we shall examine below.

II. The force of the word Religion.

Our first evidence of Antiquity, shall be from the force of the word *Religion* whereby the Fathers did prove and conclude *all Religious worship or service due to God. The name of Religion* (saith * *Lactantius*) *is deduced from the bond of piety; because God has bound man to himself*; S. *Aug.* is copious to this purpose; who in one place deduces *Religion* from another word but to the same effect, from *religendo choosing God again*, *whom we had lost*, and *serving him only*, (*Hunc eligentes vel potius religentes, nam amiseramus negligentes* &c. *Civit. Dei* l. 10. c. 4. * Elsewhere, *Our Religion stands not in the worship of the Dead* (or Saints departed.) *They are to be honoured for imitation, not to be adored for Religions sake*, and so having denied the worship of other creatures, even *Angels* too, he concludes, according to the force of the Word *Religion* given above by *Lactantius*, * *Let therefore Religion bind us to Almighty God alone.* And speaking of *worship*, † *Cultus* (saith he) the word *worship* if we say no more, agrees to many things; but if we adde

* *Lactan. l. 4. Inst. c. 28. —quòd hominem sibi Deus religaverit.*

* *Aug. de vera Relig. c. 55. Non est nobis Religio, &c.*

* *Religet ergò Religio uni omnipotenti Deo.*

† *Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 10. c. 1.*

dde to it the name of *Religion*, it di-
inguiſhes it from all other, and ſpeaks
hat worſhip which is due to God.

Our ſecond evidence, is from the Ar- III.
gument which the Fathers made for the *The Fathers* argument againſt the *Arrians.*
Godhead of our Saviour: and of his con-
ubſtantiality with the Father againſt the
Arrian Hereſy: proving the Deity of the
Son, by *worſhip* to be given unto him:
ccording to the Apoſtles argument,
Heb. 1. 6. *worſhip him all the Angels*:
nd challenging the *Arrians* for allowing
im to be worſhiped and invocated, yet
enying him to be God; which might
ave been evaded by the *Arrians* if the
Remiſs anſwer and diſtinction had been
nown doctrine then; for they might ac-
ording to that have ſaid, they allowed
im to be *religiouſly* worſhiped, not as
God, but as the moſt excellent Creature,
nd in high favour with God. Here
Athanaſius, * charging the *Arrian* Here-
ſie with this abſurdity conſequential to it,
Now that the worſhip of the Creature was done away, (*viz.* the Heathen worſhip
taken away by *Conſtantine*) *again to worſhip and ſerve a Creature, and that which was made*: ſo they accounted Chriſt to
be. Alſo in the ſame oration, he argues
againſt that ſaying of the *Arrians*, *that our* Saviour *began then to be worſhiped,*
when

* *Athan.* 2. *orat. contr. Arr.* κλίσ. μαπ χ̀ ποι- ήμαπ πά- λιν λαᾶρέυ- ειν.

when he was exalted of God; but more fully against this in his next oration: quoting that of the Apostle *Heb.* 1. 6. *Let the Angels worship him*, for a disproving of that *Arrian* tenet, and a proof of our Saviours Deity, and he goes on there to take away as it seems, the *Arrian* limitation of worship, (something like the forefaid evasion of the *Romanists*) *That he was worshiped by the Angels as higher then they in glory*, exalted above them. This the Father denies: and adds, *If he was adored as higher in glory, then ought every inferior worship him that is so*, but it ought not to be; for (saith he) *Arrianism doth not worship a creature*: citing S. *Peter* and the *Angel* who refused worship, *Act.* 10. and *Rev.* 19. then concludes, *Therefore it belongs only to God to be worshiped.* And this, saith he, the Angels know, who albeit excelling one another in glory, yet being all of them Creatures, they are not in the number or rank of *those that are to be worshiped*, but of *those that do worship*: The like argument from *adoration* he * elsewhere uses and so does *Hilary* in his books of the Trinity more then once; so does S. *Austin* use it to prove the Deity of the holy Ghost, in his first book of the Trini-

Athan. 3. *orat. contr. Arrian.* ὅτι ὡς τῇ δόξῃ μείζων — κτίσμα τῷ κτίσματι οὐ προσκυνεῖ. θεοῦ δὲ μόνου τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι.

οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν προσκυνουμένων, ἀλλὰ τῶν προσκυνούντων.

* *Athan. in libr. de Trinitate, & ad Serapionem.*

d ſixt chapter. So *Nazianzen*. *If the* Nazen. orat. 37. de ſpiritu ſancto.
ly Ghoſt is not to be worſhiped, how ἀλλ᾽ εἰ μὴ προσκυνητὸν καὶ σεπτὸν, πῶς
he deify or ſanctify us in baptiſme? —ἢ θεὸς; ἢ τίνι
if he muſt be adored, then worſhiped: μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς
worſhiped, how then is he not God? for τοῦτο ἁγιάζει—
one cleaves to or follows the other, as a golden Chain. Thus the Fathers generally proved the Deity of the Son and holy Ghoſt: becauſe to be worſhipped.

Our next evidence, that the ancient Church knew no ſuch *Religious worſhip*, is taken from the anſwers given to Heathens, who obſerving, that Chriſtians did acknowledge the miniſtery of Angels, and reſort to the memories of the Martyrs, objected to the Chriſtians, that they held and worſhiped *Angels* and *Martyrs*, like as they themſelves did their *Demons* and *Heroes*, that is, as mediators between men and the Supreme God.

IV. The *Fathers* anſwer (to the *Heathens*) denying ſuch worſhip.

Origen had to do with *Celſus* upon this argument, and acknowledges Angels to be *miniſtring ſpirits*, but *all our Vowes, interpellations — put up to God the Lord of all — by our high Prieſt* — then ſhews that our applying to Angels, *without our better knowing of them* (that is, their nature and offices) *is not agreeable to reaſon*: wherein he ſeems to relate to the Apoſtles

Orig. l. 5. contrà Celſum. *omnia Vota interpellationes, &c.*

stles ἐμβατεύειν Col. 2. 18. *an intrud*
or searching into those things a man
not seen or known: as those worshi
of Angels did, who could not see or kno
that the Angels had any such place
office appointed to them. But more
low out of this place of *Origen*, when
come to the point of *Invocation*. El
Orig. l. 8. contr. Celsum. where *Celsus* objecting that the worsh
or *honour given to those, that* the supre
God would have honoured, was a thing a
ceptable to him, so is their worshipi
of *Damons* and *Hero's*; for an *honouri*
of his subjects cannot offend him; a
that this was apparent in Kings and th
subjects and officers: and that it was
ditious to say otherwayes. This discou
of *Celsus* is not much unlike what the
manists plead for their worshiping a
honouring of Saints and Angels. B
Nostra ratio potior est, adducens nos ad serviendum uni Deo per filium— Quisquis habet Deum propitium— *Origen* by way of answer, insinuates
not so with God, as amongst men: a
that *our reason is more forcible, inducin*
us to serve God only, by his Son— and
little after saith he, *God alone is to be wo*
shiped, and prayed to by his Son— and wh
soever has God propitious by his Son t
Angel of the great Counsel, let him be co
tent; he cannot want the protection of A
gels; and more to this purpose. So ma
we say, *Our Reason is more forcible, whic*
induceth

…ducth us Protestants to refuse their way …worship, and to *serve God only by his* …, our only high Priest and mediatour.

Now hear what St. *Aug.* saith of this …atter: he tells us from *Apuleius* …d other *Platonicks* what they held their …*mons* to be, and what respect and wor- …ip they had for them. They held them …piritual or airie substances, but *denyed* …*m to be Gods*: set *in a middle* condition …e place *between Gods and men; as interpre-* …*rs and messengers that may carry from* …*nce our petitions or prayers, and bring* …*ck from thence the helps and supplies of* …*e Gods*: and *therefore they do not separate* …*e worship of these from the religion of the* …*preame Gods*; let the Romanists consider …ell what they finde like to this in their …Angel-worship; how they do *not separate* …*e worship* of Saints and Angels *from the* …*ligion and service of God*, is shewen a- …ove, *cap.* 1. *num.* 5. and *Maldonat* …ould conclude *it is a silly error of the* Lu- …herans *and* Calvinists, *yielding no honour* …*religion but to God only*: *It may* (saith …e.) *to the creature in reference to God*; …nd proves it by that which our Saviour …here reproves; their swearing by Hea- …ven.

Aug. de Civ. dei l 8. c. 22. *Medios inter Deos & homines tanquam interpretes & internuncios qui— Ideoq; cultum eorum à supernorum Deorum religione, non separant.*

Mald. in Mat. 5. 34. *Impius error Lutheran: nullum nisi Deo religionis honorem trib.*

St. *Aug.* in the same book above cited: …speaks of their resorting to the memories of

of Martyrs, and of that which was done there; and this in answer to the worship of Martyrs objected by the Heathen. *We hold not the dead Martyrs for our Gods*; no more do we, say the Romanists hold the Saints and Angels when we worship them: and no more did the heathen Platonicks hold their *Dæmons* and *Heroes* to be Gods, as above said. So then the Romanists say nothing when they so excuse their worship, as *S. Augustine* had said nothing if he had said no more to the objection then that *we hold them not to be as Gods*: therefore he goes on to shew, what honour they afford the Martyrs, and what the heathens falsly charged them with, as having them given to the Martyrs, because done at their Tombs or memories. — But saith he, * *we worship their God and honour their memories*: then for what they did there? *that the Altar, over the body of the holy Martyr, was erected there for Gods honour and worship: that the prayers and sacrifices there, were offered to God: that they gave praise there to God* for the victories *of the Martyrs, and by making a remembrance still of them, exhorted one another to imitation of the Martyrs, God being prayed to for help and assistance.*

Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 8. c. 27. *Martyres de functos non habemus Deos.*

* *Sed eorum Deum Colimus, & eorum memorias honoramus. —ad Dei honorem cultumque. —apud eorum memorias offeruntur Deo—ad imitationem—ex eorum memoriæ renovatione* ——

To *Faustus* objecting, they had but made a change from many heathen deities to their Martyrs. * He first denies, that *they are worshipped with like rites and applications*: then how they worship or honour the Saints departed; *we worship and honour Martyrs*, † *with the sort of worship*, as *we do holy men living*, which he there calls, the *worship of good will and fellowship*: and conformable to what he said above, he adds here; that is offered there, is *offered to God*, but therefore *offered at the memories of Martyrs*, that * *by the admonition or remembrance, which the very places may give us, a stronger affection may arise to inflame our charity, both towards those, whom we may imitate* (that is the martyrs) *and towards him, by whose assistance we may be inabled to do it.* But there is something here that the *Romanists* take hold of, for he saith in the same place; *Christian people by such religious solemnity, celebrate or honour the memories of Martyrs* —— *That religious solemnity* is all the † *Cardinal* could oppose out of *S. Aug.* against the many places of the same Father denying *religious worship* to the Saints. Whereas he might have seen, that *S. Aug.* calls it *religious solemnity*, not for worship given to the Martyr, but for the *religious* acts there performed

* Aug. cont. Faust. l. 20. cap. 21. *Non coli similib. variis.*

† *Eo cultu dilectionis et societatis quo in hac vita coluntur sancti homines.*

* *Ex ipsorum locorum admonitione.*

Memorias Martyrum religiosa solennitate concelebrat. ibid.

† Bel. de Beat. Sanctor. c. 12.

performed to God. But it follows in the Father, * *both to the exciting of Imitation of the Martyrs, and that the Christian people might come to a fellowship of their merits, and be helped by their prayers*— the meaning of which is, that by imitating the Martyrs, they may come to obtain what they have obtained, (which is the usual acception of *merit* with the Ancients) or that by their merits, that is, by that favour they have with God, and by their intercessions (which we acknowledge the Saints make, and the Church below has benefit by) there might be help found, and received from God. No more then this can be wrung out of this saying of S. *August.* considering what he saith so often against *such worship*, and invocation; as we see in this sect. and sect. below sect. II.

* *Et ad excitandam Imitationem, et ut meritis eorum consocietur, & orationibus adjuvetur, Aug. ut supra.*

Aug. ep. 43. & 44. Busti a Martyrum stulte frequentant — Scias à Catholicis Christianis nullum coli mortuorum.

* *Aug in exposit. Ps. 69.*

And unto *Maximus* the Grammarian objecting that the Christians did *foolishly frequent the tombs of their Martyrs, neglecting the Ghosts of their Ancestors*— He Answers as he did in his book, *of true Religion* above cited; *know thou that none of the dead are worshiped* by *Catholick Christians.* And elsewhere speaking against Heathen worship— that they worshiped Devils— *They* saith he, * *seek divine honour to be given them, but all good Angels*

Angels will that God alone be worshiped. So in his book of true Religion chap. 55. after he had said *Our Religion stands not in the Worshipping of the Dead*, he adds, *For if they lived holily, they seek not such honors, but would we should worship him*--- So in the same place, having said, *our Religion stands not in the Worship of Angels*, he affirms of them; † *This they would have, that we with them worship one God.*

When the Jewes reproached the Christians, that they would leave their Christ and worship *Polycarp*, because of the great affection they shewed to that Martyr; their Answer was as *Eusebius* relates it; that they * *would worship none else but Christ*; As for his Disciples and Imitaters, they † *Loved them worthily*; which was the *Cultus dilectionis*, as St. *Augustine* stiled it above.

Unto *Julian* reproaching the Christians, that they worshipped *miserable Men*, (so he called the Martyrs) St. *Cyril* answers, *We do not worship them with any Divine or Religious Worship: but with that of affection, observance and honour*, or as the word (χεστικῶς) implies an honour convenient and proper for them. And by his following discourse it appears wherein that honour stood; *viz.* in a

* *Quid si pie vixerunt non quærunt --Sed illum à nobis coli volunt.*

† *Hoc ipsos velle, ut unum cum ipsis colamus Deum.*

Euseb. Hist. l. 4. c. 15.

* ὐκ ἄλλον τινὰ σέβειν.

† ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως

Cyr. l. 6. contra Julianum, οὐ λατρευτικῶς, ἀλλὰ χεστικῶς καὶ τιμητικῶς.

Reverend respect they had to their, Σήκας, Repositories, where their bones, or remainder of their bodies was laid; and celebrating their praise and Vertues; *We* * *crown them*, saith he, *with the greatest honours, as those that have fought valiantly, and obtained the victory*: he adds the example of the *Grecians*, who every year celebrated the fame of those that valiantly fought against the *Persians*. So this *perpetual memory* of the martyrs is afforded them *as a reward due to their fortitude*.

* στεφανῶμεν ὡς μᾶλλον — *ibid.* Τῆς ἐναγωνίας ἀνδρείας ἀνημμένην ἀμάραντον μνήμην. *ibid.*

Add to these what *Epiphanius* saith, being put to express himself in this point, upon the Heresie of the *Collyridians*, *The Blessed Virgin* (saith he) is to be Honoured, but she is *not given to us for worship*: and afterward, Let *Mary* be had in honour, but *let the Lord be worshipped*. Also it is observable what saith upon the Pretence of the Heathen Worship, which he cals *Miseram excusationem*, a miserable excuse. *Leaving the Lord, they adore their fellow-servants*: and then their pretence, or excuse is; *that they reserve more* (or an higher sort of worship) *for God himself*: whereas

Epiph. Hær. 74. τετιμήσθω, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰς παρθένον ἡμῶν δοθεῖσα. Μαρία τετίμηται, ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσκυνείσθω.

Amb. in Ro. 1. *ver.* 21. & 25. *Relicto Domino conservos adorant — quasi plus sit, quod Deo reservetur.*

wherein we may read the *Romish* excuse. And what St. *Ambrose* saith there of their *yielding the honour of God to the Creature*: St. *August* more largely unfolds the matter in his Book of the *City of God*: where speaking of *worship*, and several sorts of it. *Many things used in and belonging to Divine worship, are yielded up to the honouring of men: whether out of too much humility, or pernicious flattery: yet so, as they to whom such honours are yielded, are still held to be men*; (as *Romanists* say, they acknowledge them as Creatures, do not worship them as Gods) *who are said to be honoured, reverenced, and, when much is yielded to them, adored.*

Honorem Dei Creatura deferre. ibid.

Aug. l. 10. *c.* 4. *Multa de cultu Divino usurpata honoribus deferri humanis, sive humilitate nimiâ, sive perniciosa adulatione, ità tamen ut iis quibus deferuntur, homines habeantur: qui dicuntur colendi, & venerandi, si autem multum iis additur, & adorandi.*

Lastly, St. *Hierom* being put to it by *Vigilantius*, who found fault with the honor given to the Reliques of Martyrs, & spoke contemptuously of them: answers thus; *We do not worship or adore the Reliques of Martyrs; no nor Angels, or Archangels: we honour their Reliques, that we may adore him whose Martyrs they are: We honour the servants, that the honour of*

Hier. ad Riparium; *Nos non dico Reliquias Martyrum—— sed nec Angelos, Archangelos—— colimus & adoramus—— Honoramus Reliquias Martyrum, ut eum cujus sunt Martyres adoremus. Honoramus servos, ut honor servorum redundet ad Dominum.*

servants may redound to their Lord. Now it will not serve to say here, which is the usual evasion of the *Romanists*; that St. *Hierom* denies them *Divine* honour; for *Vigilantius* could not think such was given to them by the ancient Christians.

V. What manner of honour allowed to the Saints.

As these Testimonies conclude against Religious Worship given to a Creature, and exclude the pretences and limitations used by the *Romanists:* so do they afford us true and allowable distinctions and limitations of Worship or Honour: as of the Blessed Virgin, she is to be *honoured* not *adored,* or to have religious worship. So *Epiph.* above; So St. *August.* above, of the Martyrs: They are to be *honoured* not *adored,*; and that honouring of them to be for *imitation* sake, not for *Religion:* and again, an honour of *charity*, not *service* or subjection. Lastly, the worship or honour of *love and fellowship*, wherewith we worship also holy men living, and that the honour of the Martyrs stands in *Celebrating their Victories*, and praise, in *giving God thanks* for them, and in propounding their examples for *Imitation:* These out of the Fathers above cited especially out of St. *Augustine.*

To these we may add St. *Greg. Nyss.*

ſen. in his praiſe of the Martyr *Theodorus*: ſpeaking to the Martyr, he ſaith, *We hold this aſſembly for thee*: but how, or to what purpoſe? *to adore our Common Lord, and make full commemoration of thy victorious combates.* So his brother St. *Baſil* in that very Oration of the 40 Martyrs (wherein the *Romaniſts* think they have a fit teſtimony for *Invocation*: we ſhall examine it in the next Section) gives ſuch reaſons, why they celebrate the memory of Martyrs. 1. *Becauſe the honour given to the beſt of our fellow ſervants, is the ſign and demonſtration of our good will and reſpect towards our Common Lord.* Where we have two words, *fellow ſervants*, and *Common Lord*, that excludes the Romiſh religious worſhip given to Saints and Angels, as we ſaw it, by thoſe words excluded in the Teſtimonies of St. *Aug.* above cited: 2 becauſe that *by remembring the vertue of the Martyr, we ſtir up to imitation* (does not ſay we ſtir up to invoke or worſhip them) Again to the Martyrs praiſe and our imitation he ſaith, *Think and call the Martyr bleſſed*, (where the Latine Tranſlation hath *Venerare Mar-*

Nyſſ. Orat. de Theod. Martyre. —σοὶ τὴν πανήγυριν —τὴν κοινὴν θεραπευτὴν συνάξεις δεσπότην καὶ ἐπινίκιον—

Bal. Orat. in 40 Mart. τιμὴ θεὸς τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἡδὺ ὁμολόγων ἀπόδειξιν ἔχει τὴ θεὸς τὴ κοινὸν δεσπότην εὐνοίας.

Κινήσωμεν θεὸς τὴν μίμησιν. ibid.

Μακάριζον τὸν μαρτυρήσαντα, ἵνα γένῃ μάρτυς τῷ θεῷ αἰρέσεως. ibid.

Martyrem, which though it may be allowed in a good sense, yet was it to be translated otherwise) and mark the end of such celebrating of the Martyrs praise and vertue: *That thou mayst so become a Martyr, in resolution and preparation of mind*, fitted, as it were, for it by often thinking and speaking him happy.

Now let us examine the Testimonies, which the * *Cardinal* brings out of Antiquity for Religious worship of Saints and Angels. In these, as also in those, which he alledges for the next point of *Invocation*, there is great cause to challenge his honesty or his diligence. For first, these Testimonies for the most part are too general; They speak an honour given to Saints and Angels, but short of that which the Church of *Rome* allows and defends. Some of them speak honour done to holy Men living; and the rest may be answered by that honour which was done to the Martyrs in frequenting their Memories, keeping their Festivals, celebrating their Victories, Vertues and Praises, or by that reverend respect had to their bones or Reliques.

* Bel. l. 1. de beat. Sanct. c. 13.

VI. Romanists unfaithful in their allegations out of Antiquity.

But secondly, we may question the *Cardinals* honesty in his very first Testimony; where he brings in *Justin Martyr* with this pomp of words. *Justin speaking*

speaking in the Name of all Christians, and delivering the faith of the whole Church, saith, We worship and adore Him (the Father) *and the Son that came from Him, and taught us these things, and the host of good Angels, and the Spirit of prophesie:* so that Author usually stiles the Holy Ghost. Now what a strange sense (little less then blasphemy) doth the *Cardinal* put upon that ancient Father for the advancing of Angel-worship! as if the Host of good Angels were set here as one of the parties to be worshipped, and that before the Holy Ghost; whereas the * *Cardinal* in his first Book *(de Christo)* did argue well, *that the Holy Ghost was not a Creature, because coupled with the Father and the Son.* This indeed was answerable to the usual argument made by the * Fathers for the Deity of the Holy Ghost; but here the *Cardinal* can couple the Host of Angels with the Father and the Son as to be adored with them, and that before the Holy Ghost. He that looks into *Justin*, will easily discern, that the *Host of Angels* there is coupled with *these things*, and both relating to the word *taught* not to *worship or adore*; For he spake immediately

Bel. ibid. —*Loquens nomine omnium Christianorum & fidem totius Ecclesiæ explicans — Illum, & Filium qui ab illo venit & docuit nos hæc, & bonorum Angelorum exercitum, & Spiritum propheticum colimus & adoramus.*

* *Bel. l* 10. *de Christo.*

* *Sic Basil l. de Spir. Sancto, c.* 18, & 19.

— διδαχθέντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν Ἀγγέλων στρατὸν. Justin, in Apolog. 2.

diately before of the wicked Angels or Devils not to be worshipped, and as the Son taught us *these things*, so likewise concerning *the Host of good Angels*.

Another place he hath out of St. *Aug.* saying to Heathens that professed to worship Angels, *i.e.* their Dæmons, *I wish you would Worship Angels, for you would then learn of them, not to worship them.* Here the *Cardinal* adds his own words in the same character, *that is, not as Gods, but as holy.* But St. *Aug.* did not intend really to commend Angel-worship to them, but wisheth they would instead of their Dæmons, honour the good Angels, and of them they might learn true worship, for he had said a little before, *The good Angels would have God alone to be worshipped.*

Aug. in Ps. 95. *Utinam velletis colere Angelos; ab ipsis disceretis non illos colere, id est* (adds the Cardinal) *non ut Deos sed ut Sanctos.*

Another Testimony he pretends from *Eusebius*, whom he makes to say, *We approach their Monuments and make Vows unto them, by whose intercession We profess our selves to be much helped.* Thus the *Cardinal* wilfully following the corrupt Translation of *Trapezuntius*; whereas *Eusebius* saith we make vowes and prayers, not to *Them*, but *there*: *i. e.* at their monuments

Euseb. de præpar. Euang. l. 13. c. 11. hath it thus: Καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ἐπὶ ταύταις (*i. e.* at their monuments) ποιεῖσθαι, πρεσβευτὰς τε τὰς μαρτείας αὐτῶν λυχάς.

monuments, but to God, as the custom then was. And that which followes, *by whose intercession we profess*— is added instead of, *we honour their blessed souls*, for so it follows in *Eusebius*.

Lastly out of St. *Chrysost.* he cites *Adoremus tumulos*— *Let us adore the Martyrs monuments*; whereas that Father saith not so, but thus: * *Let us visit, or often go thither, let us touch their Coffin or Chest, Embrace their Reliques.* This is all the Adoration he speaks of. Then a little after he shews the profit of it: *That from the sight of the Saints Monuments, and consideration of their rewards, we may gather much treasure.* Thus hath the *Cardinal* acquitted himself in the Testimonies from Antiquity.

* Chrys homil. de Juvent. & Maxime. Τῆς λάρνακος ἁπτώμεθα, τοῖς λειψάνοις περιπλεκώμεθα —ἵνα κ᾽ ἀπὸ τ ὄψεως τῶν ἀγίων μνημάτων, κ᾽ ἀπὸ τ ἐννοίας τῶν ἄθλων —

To conclude, In his arrgument which he makes from the objections of Jewes and Heathens, we may challenge his want of Candor, in concluding, that it was the practice of the Ancient Church, because their Enemies charged the Christians with such a Worship. That which the Heathens observed in the practise or doctrine of Christians was, (as we have seen above) their allowing of and depending

Bel. de beat. Sanct. c. 13.

on the Ministery of Angels, their resort to Martyrs Tombs, their offering up prayers there, their keeping the daies of the Martyrs sufferings, their celebrating of the Martyrs praise; Now it was a gross mistake in the Heathens, thence to infer, the Christian Church did worship them, or did set Angels and Martyrs in like place and office, as they did their *Damons* and *Heroes*; So is it a false inference in the *Romanists* from the practise of Christians then, to conclude a *Romish* Worship, and to make the mistaken allegation of the Heathen a pretence for it; when the Fathers in answering their objection, so plainly discover the mistake, and deny the Worship. There were some excesses, it is like, committed at the Tombs of Martyrs, by some inconsiderat Christians, but not to be charged upon the Church: as appears by St. *Aug.* his answer above, to *Maximus* the Grammarian: *A Catholicis Christianis*— *None of the Dead are worshipped, by Catholick Christians*: what ever excesses were used by some, yet *none of the Catholick Christians* so worshipped: also by what he saith of feasting and banqueting used by some at the Tombs of Martyrs: *These things are not done by the better sort of Christians.*

Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 8. c. 27. *Sed non fieri à melioribus Christianis.*

...r. I will only add what I meet with in ...e History of the Councel of *Trent* ...no 1549. How the Archbishop of *Mentz*, during the *Interim*, held a Synod, by which in the 45 Head of Doctrine, it was determined according to *St. Augustin*; *That the Saints were to be honoured, but with Civil worship, or honour of dilection and love, no otherwise then Holy Men in this Life.*

Of

SECT. II.

Of Invocation of Saints or Angels.

I. Pretence of Scripture.

AS for Scripture proof, by the Confession of *Romanists* little is to be expected in this point: yet because Scripture is Scripture, the written Word of God (as I said at * the beginning) it must and is pretended to, and many places alledged by them. *There is nothing expres's* (saith † *Salmeron*) *in the Old Testament, or Gospels, or Epistles of the Apostles, touching this matter; but in the Apocalyps, where there was occasion of writing the future success of the Church, it is expressed.* The places he notes are *ch.* 5. 8. *ch.* 6. 10. *ch.* 8. 3. which we shall touch below; but hear what he saith in his next *disputation*: * *It was not their manner in the Old Testament to use the Saints as intercessors*; the Reason; *because they were not then glorified, and because of old there was danger of Idolatry*: Mark the danger of the *Romish* practises in Religion and Worship. But was there not danger under the New Testament?

* Sect. 1. in Introduct.

† Salm. in 1 Tim. c. 2. disp. 7. *Nihil hac de re expressum habetur*——

* *Non fuisse morem in V. T. adeundi Sanctos Intercessores*—— *Erat etiam olim periculum Idololatriæ.* Salm. disp. 8 sect. postremo.

ment? he acknowledges it, saying, it is *not expreſs* but was left *to Tradition*, ſecretly to be delivered, which he cals * *the ſilent ſuggeſtion of the Spirit*: but why! *becauſe* † *it was hard to command ſuch a thing to the Jewes: and it was likely to give occaſion to the Gentiles of thinking that many Gods were put upon them, in ſtead of the many Gods they had forſaken.* And might not the ſame Reaſons ſtill be good againſt *Romiſh* Invocation, and image-worſhip, either to keep them out, or caſt them out of the Church; ſeeing they give ſuch occaſion of ſcandal to Jewes and Infidels throughout the *Romiſh* Communion?

* *Tacitam Spiritus ſuggeſtionem.* ibid.

† *Quia durum erat id Judæis præcipere, & Gentib. daretur occaſio putandi multos ſibi deos exhibitos, pro——*

The *Cardinal* is not ſo *liberal* with us, for he would confine it to the Old Teſtament, acknowledging: *It was not the cuſtom then to ſay Holy Abraham pray for us*—and his reaſons are, becauſe *they did not ſee God*, and *could not ordinarily* (*i.e.* without ſpecial Revelation) *know the prayers of the living.* Neither is the Cardinal ſo *ingenuous* with us as was his fellow *Salmeron*, for albeit he gives reaſons why prayers were not made to them in the Old Teſtament: (which reaſons were good againſt their Invocation till our Saviours aſcenſion) yet he brings places out of the Old Teſtament for a ſeeming

Bel. l. 1. de Beat Sanct. c. 19. *Non conſuetum—Nec ordinariè cognoſcere preces*—& c. 20 ſect. *ſed dices.*

seeming proof of it. Some of them indeed concern Invocation of Angels, as that *Gen.* 48. 16. & *Job* 5. 1. to which we briefly answered † above; And though the Cardinals reasons which exclude the Saints of the Old Testament, do not conclude against the Angels which did see Gods face, and as well hear and know what was said and done below on Earth, in the time of the Old Testament, as after; yet *Salmerons* Reasons might prevail against invocation of them, *because of danger of Idolatry then*,— and it would *have seemed strange and hard to the Jewes*— And albeit they *had Cherubins* in the picture, yet not Angels in their worship— Which is acknowledged by *Azor*: and *Vasquez*, and that out of several Fathers clearing the Jewish Church from Worshipping of Angels or Images; and somthing to this purpose was said † above.

† Chap. II. nu. 9.

† Chap. III. nu. 10.

— II. Places of Scripture alledged for Invocation.

Now for the places out of the Revelation, which are the only Texts that have any semblance or pretence for Invocating Saints or Angels: they are mistaken as applied to that purpose.

That Text, *Rev.* 5. 8. where the four living Creatures, and the 24. Elders are set out as *falling down before the Lamb, having harps and viols full of odours* (or incense

incenſe) *which are the prayers of the Saints.* Here the *Romaniſts* that would have theſe *prayers of the Saints*, to be meant of the prayers of men living, offered up by the Saints in heaven, are miſtaken: for the whole place is a repreſentation of the Church below offering up prayers to God by Chriſt (the Lamb) and thoſe Euchariſtical or prayers of thankſgiving and praiſe chiefly, for the Victories of the Lamb, and Redemption by Chriſt, as the next verſe ſpecifies them. Thus *Viega* underſtands them of the Church below, and he follows good Authors in it.

The next is *Rev.* 6. 10. *how long O Lord*— Here alſo is a great miſtake of *Romaniſts* making this a formal prayer of the Martyrs for revenge: which ſtands not with that charity they have in ſo great a degree; and therefore this is but a figurative or emblematical repreſentation of their Souls lying under the Altar and calling for revenge, only to ſhew the certainty of that judgement and vengeance, which God would in time bring upon the Heathen Perſecutors for their bloud: as when *Abels bloud* is ſaid to *cry* for vengeance. And for the Argument they make, *If the Souls of Martyrs cry for Vengeance upon their Enemies, therefore their*-

their charity much more prompts them to pray for Gods servants: It fails first in the Antecedent; for they do not as we see make any formal prayer for vengeance: and then it fails in the Inference, for it would only conclude that they do pray for the Church Militant, which we grant; not that they offer up prayers made to them, which is the point in question.

The third Text, *Rev.* 8. 3. where *Another Angel is said to stand by the Altar, having a golden Censer, and much incense was given to him, that he might offer it with the prayers of all Saints.* A great mistake this and impious to make this the office of any created Angel, for the very Text seems to imply that this was a special Angel differing from the seven Angels, set out in the second verse as ministring Spirits; and what one created Angel is sufficient for this, to receive and offer up their prayers that are made by all the Saints or just men on Earth? Therefore generally it is interpreted of Christ the great Angel of the Counsel of God; as *Viega*, and other modern Writers, and herein they have *Ambrose*, *Haimo*, *Rupertus*, and the *Interlinary Gloss* consenting: To whom I may add what *Irenaus* saith, reflecting upon this place, and the:

e other, *cap.* 5. 8. where ſpeaking of e Church offering up all by Chriſt, ap-es to it that of *Malachi cap.* 1. 11. *in ery place Incenſe ſhall be offered*— then ds, Now † St. *John in the Revel. ſaith, t Incenſe or the ſweet odours are the yers of the Saints.* And *Tertul.* upon at of our Saviour to the Leper clean-d: *ſhew thy ſelf to the Prieſt, and offer, Mat.* 8. 4. Inferreth, we muſt offer up l our prayers and thankſgivings *by Je-s Chriſt, the Catholick or univerſal rieſt of the Father.* No Created An-el can be ſuch a *Catholick Prieſt*, to of-r up the *Prayers of all Saints.*

Thus much for Scripture, to ſhew how eſtitute they are of any real proof, and herefore want the firſt and main ground f Catholick faith and doctrine, accor-ing to *Vincentius* his certain and ſafe ule, at firſt mentioned. Now let us ake a brief Survey of Antiquity, and ſee hat may be brought for or againſt this nvocation of Saints and Angels allowed n the *Roman* Church.

Being forſaken of Scripture, they fly o ſome ſayings of the Fathers, that ſeem o allow and commend, the practiſe, then et on foot by ſome in the fourth Centu-y; higher they cannot go for the riſe of t: and ſo fall ſhort of the ſecond ground of

† Iren. l. 4. c. 33. *Incenſa autem Joan. in Apocal. Orationes ait eſſe Sanctorum.* Tert. ad. verſ. Marcion. l. 4. c. 9. *Per Jeſum Chriſtum Catholicum Patris ſacerdotem.*

Sect. 1. in Introduct.

of Catholick doctrine, requiring it delivered down from the Apostles time held and believed in all Ages, as *Vincentius* his Rule also tels us. For clearing of this, We will lay down some General which will evince this doctrine and practise (though Ancient, yet indeed) New and not *Catholick:* and so may render what they bring, weak and impertinent to prove the contrary.

III. The opinion of some of the Ancients touching the state of the Dead inconsistent with Invocation.

First, It was the opinion of very many of the Ancients, that the Souls of the faithful, are not admitted into Heaven, or to the sight of God till the Resurrection being still in the like condition, as the *Romanists* suppose the Fathers of the Old Testament to be in; and therefore not in a condition to be invocated, or prayed to: but were prayed for, that God would *give them † light and refreshment*, as we finde in ancient forms of prayer for the Dead. *Senensis*, and other *Romish* Writers acknowledge this to be the opinion of many Ancient Fathers: and therefore Invocation of Saints could not then be Catholick belief or Doctrine; The † *Cardinal* well saw, how this was inconsistent with the ground of *Invocation*, and therefore seeks to make the Contrary appear, *viz.* that the Souls of the faithful do see God: But though many Fathers may be brought

† *Lucem & refrigerium.*

† Bell. de Beat. Sanctor. c. 1, 2, 3.

ought to the contrary, especially after many Miracles done at the Tombs of Martyrs in the fourth Age, yet the general opinion of the more Ancient Fathers (as I said, it plainly shews that Invocation of Saints could not be their before practice — *Bellarmine* seems to be troubled in shifting off two testimonies especially. The one of *John* the 22. who though of later times yet a Pope, and so bore cross to their pretended ancient belief of Invocation; which sentence of the Pope * he seeks to elevate it as if the Pope held it doubtfully and recal'd it, but elsewhere the † *Cardinal* answers roundly to it, that Pope *John* thought so, *but it was free to think so, the Church having determined nothing therein:* But Invocation of Saints departed had been a defined and determined doctrine of the Catholick Church, then would it not have been *free* for any to hold them in a place, where they could not be Invocated.

* Bell. de Beat. Sanct. c. 2.

† Bel. de Pontifice Romano, l. 4. c. 14. —*cum Liberum esset*—

The other Testimony is of *Irenæus*, one of the most ancient Fathers, most plainly asserting the former opinion, and giving Reason for it, from our Saviours example, who did, saith he, observe *the Law of the dead, that he might be the first born from the dead*; and what Law was that?

Iren. l. 5. c. 31. *Legem mortuorum servavit*—

Manifestum est, quia & discipulorum animæ— Bell. l. de beatit. Sanctorum c. 4. sect. tertio —*Erat ani. mâ beatus.* —*animâ sunt in paradiso beati.*

that? that his soul should *stay in the lo parts, unto his resurrection*; *or in an in sible place*, as he cals it in that chapte *It is manifest therefore that the Souls his disciples must stay in the invisible pla till the resurrection*, and then adds, for disciple is above his Master: Of all th the *Cardinal* saith, this only carries shew of Answer, *That Christ before h resurrection was beatified in Soul* (so w he before his death by reason of the hy postatical Union) *In like manner t Saints, while they rest, as to their bodie in the Sepulchre, are blessed in soul and Paradise.* That they were in a bless condition, though out of heaven or th beatifical vision of God was not doubted but that *Paradise* which *Bell.* in referenc to Luc. 23. 43. places them in, does no reach the highest heaven or sight of God and so he saith nothing, as to their capaci ty of being invocated. So also, what he

* Bell. l. 1. de Beat. Sanctor. c. 6. —*fuisse tamen in Paradiso Cœlesti formaliter, i. e. fuisse Beatam & gloriosam*—

saith † afterward: *That Christs Soul though it did not ascend into that corporeal Heaven, before his resurrection, yet was it in the cœlestial Paradise formally*, i. e. *it was blessed and glorious*; *Which if our Adversaries would yeeld unto the Souls of the Saints, we would not be much solicitous for that corporeal Heaven.* We cannot yeeld, nor you neither, that the Souls of Saints,

ints, if not in the higheſt heaven and
at ſight of God, could be glorified and
atisfied as the Soul of our Saviour was,
nly that they were bleſſed in Soul though
t of that heaven we yeeld; but that will
o the *Romaniſts* no good as to Invocati-
n. And if our Saviours Soul was formally
Paradiſe before his reſurrection, becauſe
was *glorioſa & beata, glorious and bea-*
ſied, then was it ſo in Paradiſe before
s death, whileſt he converſed on earth,
t was on the Croſs; for his Soul by rea-
n of the Hypoſtatical Union, was al-
ays in the Viſion of God and beatified:
nd ſo the *Cardinal* ſtill ſaid nothing to
e purpoſe. But this is enough to our pur-
oſe, that many of the Ancients deny the
ints departed, to have ſight of God till
e reſurrection, or ſpeak doubtfully of
eir place and condition: which plain-
y evinces that *Invocation* could not be a
oint then of belief or *Catholick* Doctrine.

Our ſecond General is, That this Do- IV.
ctrine or practiſe cannot be made to ap- This pra-
ctiſe of In-
vocation
took be-
ginning but
in the 4.
Century.
pear before the fourth Century: and
therefore alſo not *Catholick*. This is
proved firſt, becauſe the defenders of it
can bring no Teſtimony for it beyond
that Age. That which *Coccius* cites out
of *Origen* upon *Job*, and the *Lamenta-*

tions,

tions, is indeed not out of *Origen*; for whether of those Comments are his, [illegible] what the † *Cardinal* makes his first Testimony out of *Dionysius* his Hierarch[y] fails two waies; for that writing is [of] much later date, and the place cited [con]cerns the prayers of the Living for the Dead, not to the Dead; as appears by the purpose of the whole Chapter from whence the words are taken. The Cardinals second Testimony is from *Irenæus* an ancient Father indeed: but what saith he for *Invocation*? He cals the Blessed Virgin *Evæ Advocatum*, the Advocate of *Eve*: and *Bell.* cries, *Quid olim rius*? what more clear? If this imply an *Intercession*, yet can it not prove *Invocation*: for how could *Eve* invocate the Blessed Virgin? But this is a strong and high expression importing, not the Advocation of Words or pleading, but of Deeds and acting: The Father sets the one Woman against the other, the great Good that came by one, against the great Evil that was caused by the other; as the Scripture sets the *Womans Seed* against the Effect of the Womans transgression: the meaning of *Irenæus* in calling the Blessed Virgin *Eves Advocat*, is, that she was an Instrument or Means in bringing

† Bell. de beat. Sanctor. l. 1. c. 16.

Gen. 3.

ging forth the Saviour of Mankinde, Only Mediator between God & Man.

* *Ambroſe* may explain ſpeech of *Irenæus*, by he ſaith to like purpoſe more clearly; *Chriſt*, h he, *viſited the Woman* Mary: Mary *was viſited, that ſhe might* Eve.

* Ambr. de Obitu Theodoſii. *Fœminam viſitavit Chriſtus in Maria. Viſitata eſt Maria, ut Evam liberaret.*

What they have out of the True *Ori-*, ſpeaks only that the Saints do or may y for us, which cannot be denied; as for *Invocation*, we ſhall preſently e he declared againſt it. Such Teſtimo- s as imply the Saints interceeding or treating for us, are frequent among the ncient Fathers, and not only in General, t in Particular for thoſe they knew re: both for their particular Perſons, for their particular Neceſſities or Infir- ities, known to them, before they went om hence; for as they loſe not their *me-*, ſo they encreaſe their *charity* by go- g to God. Thus † *Igna-* *My ſpirit ſalutes you,* only now, but will al- when I obtain (or enjoy) God: So between *Cornelius* and *Cyprian*, it was agreed, that which of them went firſt to God ſhould remember the

The Interceſſion of Saints departed for the living, how far extendible.

† Ignat. Ep. ad Trallenſ. *Salutat vos ſpiritus meus non modo nunc* ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅταν Θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω.

the other. † *Let our love continue, whe-*
either of us shall be with the Lord, and l
not our prayer cease to sollicit the mercy
the Father for our brothers and sisters, le
behinde. So *Chrysost.* in his Oration
Illuminandos, to those that were to
baptized: Remember me (saith he) *wh*
that Kingdom receives you.

† Cypr. epist. 57. *Perseveret apud Dominum nostra dilectio, pro fratribus & sororibus nostris apud misericordiam patris non cesset Oratio.*

Such sayings as these, that avouch t
Saints praying for them they knew, and
general for all the Church, are often shu
fled in by the *Romanists*, as good proo
of *Invocation*, and sufficient to take t
unwary, that discern not the *Paralogis*
or inconsequent Reasoning: From suc
intercession of the Saints departed,
infer, they were (or ought to be) invoc
ted by the Living.

That which they bring out of *Athan*
sius as a Testimony of primer Antiqui
for invocating of the blessed Virgin,
taken out of the book *De Sanctiss. De*
para, Of the most holy Mother of God
Not written by that holy Father, but b
a much later and unlearned Author, an
so rejected of *Baronius* with scorn; Bu
see the other † *Cardinals* honesty o
diligence, who having censured this re
ry Book as Supposititious and written af
ter the sixt General Council, (300 years
after

† Bell. de Script Eccles. tit. Athanasius.

after *Athanasius* his Time) yet can cite it as his.

Hitherto the first proof of our second General; because the Defenders of Invocation can bring no witness for it beyond the middle of the fourth Age: Our second proof is from Testimonies excluding or denying such Invocation. *Irenæus* in his first Book speaks of Hereticks that had strange Phansies concerning *Angels*, attributing much unto them; in relation to which he denies, † *that the Church did do any thing* (he speaks of miraculous Cures done then) *by Invocation of Angels, nor by incantations, but purely and manifestly directing prayers to the Lord that made all, and invocating the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ.* *Fevardentius* his Gloss here will not help, saying the Father means *Invocation of such evil spirits as the former Hereticks used:* for if the Church had used, to the working of those cures, the Invocation of good Angels, the same Father could not have condemned their invocations, and so absolutely denied (without any mention or limitation of such use in the Church) all *Angelical invocations*; could not have bound up

V. Testimonies of Antiq. against Invocation.

† Iren. l. 2. c. 25. *Nec invocationibus Angelicis faciat aliquid, nec incantationibus, sed purè & manifeste orationes dirigens ad Dominum qui fecit omnia, & nomen Domini Jesu Christi invocans*——

the prayers of the Church (as we ſe here) to God the father through th Name of his Son. So afterward whe Cures were ſo frequently don at the Mo numents of Martyrs, the firſt and reg lar way was, as here, to direct their pra ers to God through Chriſt; not uſing *I vocations* of the Martyr; which was t abuſe creeping in by degrees, as we ſha ſee below. Our next Teſtimony is fro *Origen*, out of whom we cited ſome pa ſages * above againſt *A gel-worſhip*; ſo is he ve expreſs againſt their *Inv cation*. † Notwithſtandi that the Angels are Min ſtring Spirits as he acknow ledges, yet *all our vow prayers, thanksgivings a to be directed unto God the Lord of all, our High Prieſt, greater then all Ang* And he gives ſeverall reaſons againſt I vocation of Angels; *Becauſe* (ſaith h *to invoke Angels without knowing th* (better then we do, as to their natu condition, offices) *is little agreeable reaſon.* But, ſaith he, if had ſufficient knowledge them and their conditio yet * *this will withhold a from daring to offer prayer*

* Sect. 1. Num. 4. Orig. contra Celſum l. 5. *Omnia Vota deprecationes, & gratiarum actiones deſtinandæ ad Deum— per ſummum Pontificem—*

† *Angelos invocare abſque ipſorum cognitione—*

* *Hoc cohibebit ne quis preces audeat offerre niſi ſoli Domino Deo, qui omnibus abunde ſufficit, per ſervatorem noſtrum Dei filium. Angelos habet ſatis Propitios—*

prayers to any save God alone, who abundantly is sufficient for all through our Lord Jesus Christ; and because this *will render the Angels sufficiently propitious to us, and willing to do all things for us: if we (so far as humane nature permits) be well affected, as they are to Gods service.* Something like it is, that S. *Aug.* saith of every good Angel † *In illo me audit, in illo me adjuvat. He hears me in him* (*i.e.* in God when I pray to God) *he helps me.*

† Aug. de vera Relig. cap. 55.

To the like purpose doth *Origen* reply again to *Celsus, that prayers are to be offered up to God alone by his only begotten Son* and this exclusive to Angels, because opposed to *Celsus* pleading for their going to God by their *Dæmons: For our Saviour Christ*, saith *Origen*, * *as high Priest presents our prayers to God the Father.* Again, † *Whosoever*, saith he, *hath God propitious by the Angel of the great Counsel, Jesus Christ*, he may be *content* with that, and shall *not want protection: for the multitude* (of Angels) *seeing men imitating their piety towards God, helps them, whilest they contend to salvation, calling upon God.* This was the wholesome doctrine

Origen. l. 8. *contra Celsum prope initium.*

* *Qui ut pontifex eas deferat ad Deum.*

† *Quisquis habet Deum propitium propter magni consilii Angelum— —quæ multitudo (Angelorum) cum videt homines suam erga Deum pietatem imitantes, adjutat eos contendentes ad salutem, & Deum invocantes.*

of those times. And to the same tenor sounds that which above was cited out of *Tertul.* saying we must offer up all *by our Catholick*, or universal *High Priest* Jesus Christ, call'd so to the exclusion of all others.

V. Invocation of God alone asserted in that Age.

Our third General is, After the Practise began in some manner towards the end of the fourth Age, yet do we find the former doctrine, of *God alone to be Invocated by Jesus Christ*, asserted often in the Fathers; * St. *Ambrose* speaking with relation to the two young Sons of *Theodosius*, *yet thou O Lord art only to be invocated*, that is, for a blessing and protection upon them. And in *Rom.* 1.21. (if those commentaries be his, or if of a later writer, it is so much more to the prejudice of Invocation) He answers the Heathens excuse for their coming to the *Creator* by the *Creatures* that they did it, as to Kings we come by *Comites & Tribunos* by their great officers at Court: (the *Romanists* use the like reason or excuse,) *We come* (saith the Father) *by such officers to the King, because he is a man, and knowes not all — But God knows all mens conditions and merits, and we need not use such an Intercessor to Him but only a devout mind.* *Chrysost. often to the like purpose denying the way of coming

* A mbr. de obitu Theod. *Tu tamen Domine solus es invocandus.*

Ambr. in Rom. 1.21. *Per Comites perveniatur ad Regem quia homo est, & nescit—*

* Chrys. 4. hom. de Pœnit. *In Deo nihil tale.*

coming to God, to be like the manner of Kings Courts; *In God*, saith he, *there is no such thing*: Elsewhere he forbids us *to bring in Angels*, when we would have any thing prosper, but with reference to the Apostles precept, *Col.* 3. 17. *do all in the name of the Lord Jesus*; he bids, *set that name before, and all things will be happy and prosperous*: and do not *bring in Angels*; and the marginal note in the *Paris* Edition is; *Angeli non adjungendi ad invocationem Trinitatis: Angels are not to be joyned, when we invocate God*: indeed it is *Athanasius* his argument for the Deity of our Saviour; because the Apostle joyns him in prayer with the Father, 1 *Thes.* 3. 11. as above cited; and this makes *Athanasius* interpret the *Angel*, which *Jacob* seemed to joyn with God in Invocation (*Gen.* 48. 16. to be Christ; — and by many examples he shews, none to be Invocated but God: and speaking of *David*, *He never invocated any save God himself*: Now to answer here as *Romanists* would do, that *the Saints* were then out of sight of God; or that none was to be invocated as God, but God himself: would be first impertinent, because the *Angels* whom *Athanasius* expresly excludes from being Invoked, did see the face of God then, as

Chryst Hom. 9. in 3. Colos. μὴ πρὸς Ἀγγέλους παρεισάγεις.

Chap. 1. nu. 5. Athan. in 4. contra Arrianos.

ἐκ ἄλλον ἢ αὐτὸν Θεὸν παρεκάλεσε, ibid.

well as now, also because such answer if it were proper by that limitation (*as God*) would render the Fathers Argument invalid aud impertinent, when he so often proves the Deity of our Saviour by *Invocation*, and so doth other Fathers after him.

Hier. l. adversus Vigilant.

St. *Hierom* lived in the fourth age, after that practise began, but if it had been the practise or doctrine of the Church, he would not have spared *Vigilantius* in that point, as he doth not in any, wherein he could have advantage against him. Seeing therefore he only defends the Saints *praying for us*, which was the Doctrine of the Church, hath nothing in defence of our *Invocating them*, it is evident this was no doctrine, nor to be accounted of as the practise of the Church: yet is St. *Hier.* often cited as a witness for *Invocation*; because upon other points he wrote against *Vigilantius*, who found fault with that beginning practise of Invocation.

Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 22. c 10. *Nominari à Sacerdote, non invocari.*

St. *Aug.* saith expressly, of the Martyrs, *they are named in the daily Sacrifice, they are not invocated.* Indeed it was later by much ere Invocation of Saints came into the publick office; But St. *Auguſt.* being by the objections of Enemies often put to it, punctually to set down what

was

was done at the Monuments of Martyrs, (as we saw * above) no where mentions *Invocating* of Them but of God. † Sect. 1. nu. 4.

But the † *Cardinal* boldly, though untruly, tels his Reader, that St. *Aug.* teacheth, *the Saints are not to be Invocated as Gods, but as those that can obtain of God, what they will:* and the places he notes are, *De Civit. Dei. l.* 8. *c. ult. & l.* 22. *c.*10. whereas St. *Aug.* in the first place speaks of no *Invocation* but of God, and for the Martyrs he speaks only of our *Imitating* them. In the second place he expressly denies they are *Invocated,* as we cited it hard above. Again the * *Cardinal* saith, St. *Aug.* teacheth, *that in the Sacrifice it self, there is a remembrance made of the Martyrs, and that they are invocated, that they would pray for us.* The places he cites, are *Tract.* 84. *in* 7*o.* and *Serm.* 17. *de verbis Apostoli.* Now its strange that St. *Aug.* should so forget himself, as in one place to say, they *are named* or remembred in the sacrifice, *not invocated:* and in another to say (as the *Cardinal* imposes upon Him and the Reader) *they are invocated*; In the first

† Bell. l de Beat. Sanct. c.17. sect. Quarto *Sanctum Augustinum, docere Sanctos Invocandos non ut Deos, sed ut qui à Deo impetrent, quod volunt.*

* Bell. l. de Beat. Sanct. c. 19 sect. ult. —*docere, quòd in Sacrificio ipso memoria fiat Martyrum, & invocentur, ut pro nobis orent.*

place St. *Aug.* ſaith, *We do not remember Martyrs there, as we do others that reſt in peace,* * *to pray for them, but rather that they pray for us, that we may follow their ſteps.* In the ſecond place, thus: *The Martyrs are recited at the Altar, not that we ſhould pray for them, For its an Injury to pray for a Martyr,* * *to whoſe prayers we ought to commend our ſelves.* This is the moſt that fell from St. *Aug.* yet this comes ſhort of what *Bell.* will have him ſay, that they are then *Invocated* at the Altar; for he had ſaid expreſly, *they are not invocated,* and that we *invocate God* there, to *inable us to imitate* them, as above in the two places out of his book *de Civit. Dei.* What then is this *commending our ſelves to their prayers?* it cannot be *direct Invocation,* for that he denies: but an invocating of God or begging of him, the benefit of their prayers; as we ſhall ſee more below.

* —*Non—ut pro iis oremus, ſed magis ut ipſi pro nobis orent, ut eorum veſtigiis adhæreamus.*

* *Cujus nos orationibus debemus commendare.*

We have found the *Cardinal* very unfaithful hitherto in his Teſtimonies of Antiquity: we will add two more; He cites *Chryſ.* 5. *Hom. in Matt.* which is plainly of the prayers of the living Saints. It ſpeaks of the woman of *Canaan* coming of her ſelf to Chriſt without ſuing to any of the Diſciples to entreat for her; *And this* (ſaith he) *I ſpeak, not that we ought*

ἵνα μὴ ἱκετεύωμεν τοὺ ἁγίους. Chryſ.

ught not to entreat or sue to the Saints—— the other place is that which we noted above, how corruptly it was cited by the *Cardinal*, for the *Worship* of Saints; here again for the *Invocation* of Saints; afterward it is again alledged by him for *vowes* made to Saints: it is out of *Euseb. de prepar. Evang. l.* 13. *c.* 11. where as we noted above, in stead of *making vowes and prayers at the Monuments of Martyrs*, the Interpreter has rendred it, *making vowes to them*, that is, to the Martyrs; and this (in three times alledging this Testimony) the Cardinal would not see.

Our fourth General. That practise of Invocation which began in the fourth Century was not such as the *Romish* is, either for the *manner* or the *use*: that is, it was not formal and direct Invocation, nor used in sacred offices till long after.

VI. The Invocation begun in the fourth Age was not such as the Romish is.

1. They were *Wishes* not formal Invocation: as *Nyssen* upon our Saviours, *When ye pray*, *Luc.* 11. 2. distinguisheth between εὐχεσθε, *vowing*, and προσευχεσθε *praying* by direct address and petition to God: so we in this discourse of Invocation, must distinguish between εὐχην a vow or wish, and προσευχὴν a praying to, or religious address to any by petition: So when they cryed out in the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Oret pro nobis Flavianus*,

Nyssen. de Oratione Dominica, orat. 2.

Flavianus, Let *Flavianus* pray for us: it was a speaking of their judgment of *Flavianus* his being in bliss, and a *wishing* of the benefit of his intercession. Thus we finde in *Theodorets* History of the Lives of many Fathers, such closures of most of them; *I wish and desire, that by their intercession I may obtain the divine help.* Some think there are additions and insertions made in this work; but whether these be *Theodorets* words, or any others, they do speak the *wish* of having the benefit and effect of the Saints prayers put up for the Church below. But this is not Invocation.

Theod. in Sanct. Patrum hist. *Rogo & quaeso ut ipsorum intercessione divinum consequer Auxilium.*

2. In that practise, we meet with for the most part only *Indirect Invocation*; that is, a praying to God himself directly, that he would vouchsafe the effect of the Saints Intercession, or prayers they made in behalf of the Members of the Church below, and give the benefit thereof unto them as he saw fit. This still is not the *Invocating of Saints*, which we contend about; no more then *Moses* can be said to have Invocated *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, when he prayed to the Lord to remember them, in behalf of that people, *Exod.* 32. 13. To this sense speaks that passage of St. *Aug.* cited somtimes by *Romanists* for Invocation and explained

Aug. l. 20. c. 21. contra Faustum.

ed above Sect. 1. nu. 4. Speaking of Christian people frequenting the Tombs of Martyrs with a Religious solennity, *that they may be stirred up to imitation of the Martyrs, come to a fellowship of their merits, and be helped by their prayers*; and this not by invocating or praying to them; but by imitating of them, and praying to God there, for his *aid to inable us to imitate them*, and for his favour in affording us the benefit of their prayers. this is not *Invocation* of the Saints, but of God: and if St. *Aug.* had asserted a direct Invocation of the Martyrs themselves, he had yielded up the Cause to *Faustus*; To the like sense is that which we noted * above of St. *Aug.* his saying *Commendare nos orationi— we ought to commend our selves to the prayers of the Martyrs: not by direct Invocating of them, but of God*, as before; And to this purpose also that of *Aug.* elsewhere, which at first hearing sounds harsh: Where enquiring what benefit accrews to a mans friends to have their bodies laid near the Monuments of Martyrs; He saith he sees none unless this, that when they look upon the place where their dear friends lye buried, *they may be moved to commend them to those Saints as Patrons, to finde help with God*, yea but he saith, *commend them*

—*quo adjuvante possumus imitari.* ibid.

* Hac Sect. nu. 5.

Aug. de cura pro mort. c. 4.

—*iisdem Sanctis illos tanquam Patronis susceptos, apud Dominum adjuvandos orando commendent.*

them by praying; true, but to God not to the Saints or Martyrs themselves. To this purpose of indirect invocation speaks that of *Cyril* in his Catech. cited also by the *Cardinal*. When *we offer the sacrifice We make mention of the Saints* (does not say we Invocate them) *that God by their Intercession may receive our prayers.* Thus far it prevailed so as to have approbation; and the practise of this Indirect Invocation (or praying to God at Martyrs Tombs, and begging for their sakes) got strength by a common opinion of many, that when God was so invocated or prayed to, then the Martyr was present, as some thought, or did joyn his prayers with them, as most thought. This St. *Aug.* leaves as uncertain in his Book, *de Cura pro mortuis*: *c.* 16. and something of doubt in his Book, *de vera Relig. c.*55. But there he concludes for certain of the good Angel in *illo me exaudit, adjuvat*, he *hears me in God*, and *helps me in God*, that is, when I pray, or by my praying to God, I have the Angels help; we may indeed say it with comfort, as *Origen* did above in answering to *Celsus*. He that piously and faithfully invocates God, is sure to have the Angels propitious, and the benefit of their ministry; So is he sure to have the benefit of the Prayers, which

the

the Saints put up in behalf of the Church Militant.

I may add here that place of *Basil* often alledged by the *Romanists*, but see how abused by the *Cardinal*: who thus alledges it, (*Qui aliqua premitur angustia ad hos confugiat; qui rursus lætatur hos oret.*) *He that is distressed let him fly to these, again he that rejoyceth, let him pray to these.* Where we have a double corrupting of the Text; St. *Basil* saith, *he doth fly to these*, the *Cardinal* saith, *let him fly to these*; again the Father saith, *he doth run to these*, the *Cardinal* saith, *let him pray to these*; The Father in this oration, at the beginning of it, gives Reasons, why they celebrate the Daies of Martyrs with such panegyricks: *viz.* to praise their vertue, and propound them as examples for imitation, but saith nothing of Invocating them. Basil. in Orat. de 40. Martyr. prope finem. —ἐπὶ τούτους καταφεύγει. —ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀποτρέχει.

And concerning these 40 Martyrs he insinuates, that at *Cæsarea* they had a Church bearing their name; that there was help to be had by their joynt prayers; *there*, saith he, *a mother praying for her sons is heard*, he doth not say, praying to Them, but *there*, *i.e.* at their Monument, and it follows immediately, *let our prayers be made or joyned with the Martyrs*— upon —ἐνταῦθα εὐχομένη. μετὰ μαρτύρων γενέσθω τὰ ἀιτήματα ἡμῶν.

ſuppoſal of their continual praying for the Church below.

3. By degrees it came to *direct* and downright *Invocating* of the Martyr; but this not to be imputed to All, or to Moſt, but to the Exceſs of ſome private men in their devotions and applications to the Martyr. It pleaſed God to work many wonders at the Memories of the Martyrs for the honour and confirmation of that faith, for which they dyed: and in thoſe daies, eſpecially when the *Roman Empire* was to be ſubdued to the faith and confirmed in it; wherefore it became a cuſtome to frequent thoſe places and to offer up prayers there to God. And ſome in begging relief of God, were eaſily led on to ſpeak directly to the Martyr, and deſire his interceſſion; ſuch was the riſe of *Invocation*, the exceſs of ſome particular men in addreſſes to the Martyr: And the frequency of Miracles and Cures done at their Monuments, and upon thoſe that applied there to God Almighty, eaſily drew on the Vulgar ſort to a downright application to the Martyr, and cauſed ſome ſpeeches to fall from eminent Fathers as allowing and commending that *New Devotion*, out of their great Affection they bore to the honour of the Martyrs, and

and their great desire of magnifying the glory of Martyrdom, or suffering for the Faith; And such excess of speech we meet with usually in the close of an homily or oration, when the reins are let loose to Rhetorical excursion; whereas when they deliver themselves *dogmatically*, to lay down any thing by way of Doctrine, they speak more safely, and in this very point more conformably to the former Catholick Doctrine, of *Invocating God alone*. This is plain in *Chrysostome*, to him that will but look, what and how he delivers himself in the body of his Homily upon the Text of Scripture, and then how he often lashes out in his *Ethicon* or Application at the end of it. * *Sixtus Senensis* gives us a good caution to this purpose, and he gives it with a *Sæpe Monuimus*, we have often admonished, that the words of the Fathers are not alwaies to be taken as they sound, for in their declamatory Orations and Sermons they often speak, *affectuum impetu & orationis cursu rapti*, carried on more violently by the force of affection, and the course of their Oration.

* Lib. 6. Annot. 152.

And therefore what fals from them in this kinde, we should rather cover or fairly interpret, then produce it as the *Romanists* do in this point, to make argument

ment of it for Invocation of Saints and Angels against the former Catholick Doctrine delivered by the foregoing Fathers: and therefore also in the preceding General I have endeavoured to shew, that some of the Fathers speeches alledged by *Romanists* for *direct Invocation* of Saints, or Angels, do but indeed mean the *indirect*, which makes the address or Prayer to God himself. There are three other Testimonies out of the Fathers, which are much urged. One of *Chrysostome*, speaking of the Emperour at the Monuments of Martyrs, *Supplicating them that they would be his Patrons with God: and he, that wears the Diadem, Supplicates the Tent-maker and the Fisherman (Paul* and *Peter) as Patrons.* This the Father Rhetorically sets forth, to magnifie the Faith of Christ, and to shew that the greatest in this worlds glory do need the benefit of the prayers of Saints: and so the word (δέεται) signifies to *need* as well as to *supplicate*. Now whether the Emperour did by *direct Invocation* supplicate them, or beg of God to have benefit by them is not expressed; if he did the first it was an excess according to the New Devotion: if the second, it was tolerable.

Chrys. in 2 Cor. Hom. 26.

Τῦ σκηνοποιῦ καὶ τῦ ἁλιέως δεόμενον δέεται ὁ τὸ διάδημα ἔχων.

Another

Another Testimony is cited out of S. *Ambrose*, in his Book *De Viduis*, *the Angels are to be intreated, the Martyrs are to be entreated.* This may be interpreted, to be the obsecration or Intreaty of *Deeds* rather then *Words*; for there he teaches a widdow (pleading she was weak and without help) to make the Apostles her friends and neighbours to procure her help, as *Peter* and *Andrew* intreated our Saviour to cure *Peters* wifes mother: Now the way to make them so to her, was *to draw near to them in the fellowship or likeness of piety and doing good; for it was not the relation of blood, but the kindred of vertue*, that makes the Martyrs our friends and neighbours—Then a little after; *the Angels are to be intreated, for they are given to us for ministration; and Martyrs to be intreated because we are in the body as they have been*—The ministry of Angels— and the remembrance the Martyrs have of what they suffered in the body, is a good argument to assure us, that Angels are ready to help, and Martyrs do pray for all those, *that draw near to them in vertue*: but no argument for our Invocating them: such a Doctrine is as harsh and streined as his reason which follows, that the Martyrs are fit to *interceed for our sins* that

Ambros. de Viduis *Obsecrandi sunt Angeli, Obsecrandi Martyres* —

—*Si ipsis devotionis societate & misericordiæ muneribus appropinques.*

—*Virtutis cognatio proximos facit.*

that washed their own sins in their own bloud, which if not candidly interpreted is directly contrary to Scripture, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. *Rev.* 1. 5. But St. *Ambrose* is thought to be but a young Christian when he wrote that book. * Afterward he could say, *Thou O Lord only art to be Invocated.*

* Ambr. de Obitu Theodosii.

The last is of *Nazienzen:* relating how *Justina* a virgin calling upon the blessed Virgin in distress was helped: *Nazienzen* was deceived in that Book of *Cyprians* conversion (from whence he had that story) for it is false and forged as to the conversion of *Cyprian* the Martyr. But it may be said, whether the book be forged or no, and the story of *Justina* true or false: yet *Nazienzen* approves the fact or practise. We answer that he tels us; *she betook her self to God for help*, and to *Christ:* that she strengthened her self with the Examples of *Susanna*, *Daniel*, &c. then follows, *having considered these things, she also supplicated the Virgin* Mary, *that she would help a Virgin now in danger:* and so he leaves the story, neither commendig this practise, nor reproving it.

Nazien. Orat. 18. in Laudem Cypriani.

Ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν καταφύγει,— ταῦτα ὁπλισαμένη, καὶ τὴν παρθένον Μαείαν ἱκετεύσασα βοηθῆσαι παρθένῳ κινδυνευούσῃ.

We have seen what Testimonies the *Romanists* alledge out of the Fathers, and how faithfully it is done, especially by the

Cardinal. One Argument remains, which all of them make from the *ſucceſs* they found who applyed themſelves to the Martyrs, whereby it is evident that God did approve the practiſe. But this is a fallacious Argument, *à non Cauſa:* making their invocation of the Martyr to be the *Cauſe* or motive of Gods hearing and granting ſucceſs. It is certain in Hiſtory, that many were heard, who reſorted to the monuments of Martyrs and prayed to God there; yea many that prayed there to God with reference to the Interceſſion, which the Martyr and all other Saints made for the Church below; but if ſome were heard, that did directly invocate, or pray to the Martyr, (of which Examples cannot certainly be given) we may ſay, God overlooked the Excеſs, or the *voluntaries of their mouth,* as St. *Auguſt.* call'd his Exceſſes or breakings out in his praying for his mother, whom he believed to be in bliſs: hoping that God would pardon the extravagance. And as the ſame Father inſinuates, God overlooked and pardoned the infirmities of the Midwives not ſpeaking altogether according to truth, and rewarded their good will, *Exod.* 1. 20. *Their untruth could not deſerve praiſe, might obtain pardon.* So when the *Romaniſts* urge the

Aug. Confeſſ. l. 9. c. 13. *Voluntaria oris mei.*

Aug. Qu. 12 in Exod. —*non potuit ad laudem ſed ad Veniam pertinere.*

the miracles (which *Augustine* sent ther by *Greg.* the first, is said to work Gods witness to the Truth of all the D ctrines he brought from *Rome*; we those Miracles (supposing them to wrought) were Gods witnesses to Catholick Faith which *Austin* preache and planted here; not to all that taught: God in mercy overlooking the lesser errors and vanities, when he w pleased and saw it fit to give testimon by those Miracles to the Faith of Chri But this may suffice for the former Arg ment. If therefore we be asked, wh we do not conform in this practise to t Ancient Church, it may be answered Because we see what the more Ancien Church held, and practised: and we find by St. *Aug.* that many things were done at the Martyrs Tombs, *but not by the be ter sort of Christians*, as we noted above Sect. 1. nu. 6. and that in his answer to *Faustus*; about the worship or honour given to Martyrs, he concludes thus: *It one thing that we teach, another thing which we bear with— and we are compelled to tolerate it, till we can amend it.* Therefore, because we saw much deflexion in the *Romish* practise from the Primitive Verity, when we had opportunity and power to amend it (the thing St. *Aug.* desired)

Aug. con. Faust. l. 20. c. 21. *Aliud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus-- Et donec emendemus tolerare compellimur.*

ed) we did it, and with good Reason: lowing in this point what may consist h Catholick Doctrine; such we count e εὐχὴν, the *wish* of having benefit by ose prayers, which the Saints above ake for the members of the Church mi- ant and labouring below; yea such we y account the indirect Invocation, hich begs of God that benefit, or effect f those Prayers; but we cannot account e προσευχὴν, or direct Invocation, o consist with Catholick Doctrine, when is made to Saints, and that by way f Religious addres, as the Church of ome practiseth it in her offices, which ractise none of the Ancients knew.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Of Image-worſhip.

I. Romaniſts altogether forſaken here, of Scripture and Antiquity.

HOw the *Romaniſts* labour in t point to ſtand againſt *Scriptu* which ſo forcibly encounters them, w ſaw above, *Chap. III.* and there was a ſwered what they bring from *Pſ.* 99. *to worſhip his footſtool,* and the Images the *Cherubins* upon the Ark; This the beſt and only plea they can mak from Scripture: yet ſo weak and un grounded, that their own Authors give it over as impertinent, and raiſed upon a falſe ſuppoſal, *that the Jewiſh Church had any Images for worſhip:* as aboveſaid *Ch.* 3. *nu.* 10. Now let us ſee how they ſtrive to bear up againſt the univerſal conſent of Antiquity, which with a ſtrong Current for 700 years runs contrary unto them.

The firſt Evidence.

Our firſt evidence againſt this *Image-worſhip.* Had there been any ſuch thing amongſt Chriſtians, thoſe Ancient Apologiſts and Defenders of Chriſtian Religion againſt Heathens (*Juſtin, Clemens, Tertullian, Minutius, Lactantius, Arnobius, Euſebius*)

Eusebius) would have mentioned it, when they give account of the worship used in their assemblies; Nay they could not have declined it, when they set themselves to refute the Heathen Image-worship. And therefore *Tertul.* in his *Apologetick* professes and defends their not worshiping of Images. *If therefore* (saith he) *we do not worship Statues and cold Images, like indeed to the Dead whom they represent: and which Birds and Spiders understand well enough, it deserves praise rather then punishment.* See how he not only denies the worship, but vilifies them as unfit for worship, *cold*, and *like the Dead*, and that the *Birds understand them*, and therefore fear not to dung upon them. *Minutius Fœlix* answering *Cecilius* a Heathen, that objected against the Christians their having no Temples, no Images, gives reasons wherefore they had not, or not used them in worship. *Clemens Alexandr.* as he denies the Jewish Church had any Images to worship: saying * Moses *set no statue or figure in the Temple to be worshiped*, so is he very severe against Images among Christians, insomuch that he scarce allowes the Art of painting or of making Images: as we may see in his *Protreptic.* *Origen* had to do with *Celsus* about

Tert. Apol. c. 12. *Igitur si statuas & imagines frigidas mortuorum suorum similimas non adoramus, quas milvi & aranea intelligunt, nonne laudem——*

* Clem. strom. 5. Ἐφ' ὑψηλᾶς σεβάσμιον,

worship

worship and *Invocation*, and to answer why the Christians gave it not to Angels (whom they acknowledged to be ministring Spirits sent of God) as they (the Heathen) gave it to their *Daemons*; which in the two former *Sections*; But he was also put to satisfie *Celsus*, why the Christians did not use Images: and for which he compares them to *Scythians* & *Barbarians*, that had no Temples and Images, because they knew not what the Gods or Heroes were. How does *Origen* answer? by saying as a *Roman* would do, we only hate the heathen Idols and decline them, but as for the Images of Christ and his Saints, we have and worship them? No! *They and we* (answers *Origen*) *have not the same cause of declining these things*; and again, *Those barbarous Nations are moved to it by other reasons then Christians and the Jewes are, to whom it is horrid impiety, so to worship the Deity. They keep themselves carefully from these, because of the Law.* Deut. 6. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and him shalt thou serve*, and that of Exod. 20. *Thou shalt not make to thy self a graven Image:* And because

Origen contra Celsum l. 7. *Non eandem eversandi causam esse illis & nobis.— Aliis rationibus moventur quam Christiani & Judæi, quibus Religio est, hc Numen colere —Sibi ab his temperant propter illud Legis*, Deut. 6. Exod. 20.

Celsus

Celsus had said, *Those Barbarians* have *not Temples, Altars, Images*, by reason *that they know not what the Gods and Heroes are:* therefore *Origen* subjoyns here; *It is impossible that he who knowes God should be a worshipper of Statues.* Again, *We therefore do not honour Images, because we take heed, as much as in us lies, least by any means we fall into the Credulity of attributing to them, any thing of Divinity.* In like manner *Minutius Felix* and *Arnobius* were put to answer the *Heathens*, challenging the *Christians* for having no *Temples, Altars, Images*; for which *Cæcilius* reproaches them, *that they could not shew the God, they worship*, and is answered, *We believe our God, though we see him not.* Again he reproaches them with their poverty and afflictions, as if their God could not help them, *The Cross is not to be worshiped by you, but born:* and is answered, *We neither worship Crosses, nor desire them.* And *Man is the Image of God*— *Arnobius* answers the like challenge—and is so far from acknowledging that Christians had Images, or did worship their God by Images, (as he must needs have done, if they had Images then)

Impossibile est ut qui Deum novit supplex fiat Statuis. —Nos ideò non honorare simulachra, quia quantum possumus cavemus ne quo modo incidamus in istam Credulitatem—

Minut. in Octavio.

Cruces nec Colimus nec optamus. ibid.

Arnob. l. 6. *Contra Gentes.*

then) that he replies to the Heather that said, we worship the Gods b Images; *What*, saith he *can be more injurious, mo reproachful to say they kno God, and yet worship ano ther thing, to profess the hope for help from the Deity, and yet tur to and supplicat the Image which has sense?* which speaks reason against Image worship in Heathens or Christians.

—Scire Deum & rei alteri supplicare. Opem sperare à Numine, & ad Effigiem nullius sensus deprecari.

Lactan. l. 2. c. 18. *Perversum est ut simulachrum homi nis à simulachro Dei colatur.*

Lactantius amongst many saying against this folly, hath this: *It's absurd that the Image of man should be worshipe by the Image of God.* The Ancient Coun cil of *Eliberis* in *Spain* decreed, *That Pi ctures ought not to be in the Church.*

Epiph. Epist. ad Johan. Hieros. *Velum depictum, habens imaginem quasi Christi vel sancti cujusdam.*

Epiphanius was very severe against Images; as he shewed both by Deed and Doctrine. A *Anablatha*, going into Chappel to pray, he finds Veil hanging there, and *having in it picture, as of Christ, or some other Saint* wherefore he cut it in pieces as a thing not to be suffered in the Church *against the Authority of Scripture*, as he relate it himself in his Epist. to *John* Bishop o *Jerusalem*, in whose Dioceſs that place was. The *Cardinal* not liking the shift that some of their writers make to avoid the

prejudice of this Authority: thought good to * cut off that part of the Epistle as suppositious, and added to the rest by an after hand; but this is sure, that St. *Hierom*, who was contemporary to *Epiphanius*, and held correspondency and friendship with him, translated the whole Epistle out of Greek into Latin: this part of it as well as the rest, and accounted this to be *Epiphanius* his deed and Report; and this one thing is of more weight then those many petty pretences of Reasons, which the *Cardinal* holds out for the proof of what he said. Now let us hear what *Epiphanius* saith doctrinally of Images. Writing against the *Collyridians*, that worshipped the Virgin *Mary* calling her the *Queen of Heaven:* he tels us the Original of Images, or rather of the honour and worship they got in the world, *that the Devil brought them in under pretence of Just*, (that is, of giving famous men their due, by honouring them after death) *creeping into the minds of men, and * consecrating or deifying the mortal nature to divine honours, set before mens eyes humane likenesses and Images polished with great art: that seeing they that are worshipped, were dead* (and out of sight) *their Images might appear,*

* Bell. l. 2. de Imagin. cap. 9. sect. ad quintum.

Epiph. de Collyridianis Hær. 79.

+ πεφάσθαι δικαίως.

* θεοποιῶν.

pear, and receive the honour and adoration. So that ancient Father.

Ambr. de obitu Theodosii *Regem adoravit, non lignum utique, quia hic Gentilis est error, & vanitas Impiorum.*

St. *Ambrose*, hath this passage of *Helena* mother of *Constantine* when she had found the very *Cross* of Christ. *She worshiped the King* (Christ) *not the Wood.* The *Cardinal* replies, *that St.* Ambrose *would have the Cross*, not adored for it self, but *for Christs sake:* as if that Age of the the Church knew the new *Romish* distinctions, or limitations, of giving worship to Crosses and Images, for themselves, or for the Exemplars sake; but the *Cardinal* did advisedly in cutting off what follows in that Father, *for this is a Heathen Error and vanity of the wicked*, viz. *to worship such things religiously*; yet there he findes something, which he thinks may favour the adoration of the Cross. *Helena* (saith *Ambrose*) *did wisely in setting the Cross upon the head of Kings*, (for she had commended it to *Constantine* her son to set it upon his Crown) *that the Cross of our Lord might be adored in Kings.* What? that material Cross, placed on the Diadem of any King, *be adored?* So must the *Cardinal* suppose it: or else he must grant that the intent of *Helena* and the saying of St. *Ambrose* upon it, was only to shew,

—*Levavit Crucem in capite Regum ut Crux Domini in Regibus adoretur.* Ambr. ibid.

what

what esteem she had, and all others ought to have of the Passion of Christ; and therefore it follows in St. *Ambrose*, *This was not a strange or unseemly thing, but Piety: seeing the honour is given to the sacred Redemption.*

Non insolentia hæc, sed pietas cùm defertur sacræ Redemptioni.

Hear now what St. *Aug.* saith in several places in his Book of the *manners or Customs of the Church*, he notes *some to be Worshipers of pictures and sepulchres:* and puts them among the *companies of ignorant and indiscreet men*; and saith the Church owns not, allows not such custome or practise. The *Cardinal* replies, *Peradventure St.* Aug. *speaks of the Idols of the Gentiles, —Peradventure of those that did superstitiously*; without all peradventure St. *Aug.* speaks not of Heathen Idols, —but of the irregular honour given by some to the Martyrs; and without any peradventure, they did superstitiously worship and honour them, for that necessarily follows upon *Religious worship* given to a Creature: and cannot be declined in the Church of *Rome*. But after two *peradventures* the *Cardinal* is resolved to say, St. *Aug.* was then newly converted when he wrote that Book, and *so* * *offended with some customs of the Church* (it

Aug. de Morib. Eccles. cap. 34. *Sepulchrorum & picturarum Adoratores — Turbas Imperitorum.*

Bell. de Imag. l. 2. cap. 16. *Forte —*

* *Offensum quibusdam ritibus Ecclesiæ.*

seems the *Cardinal* took that practise which St. *Aug.* blames, to have been (Custom or usage of the Church) but *after being better instructed, he could excuse them.* But where did St. *August.* ever excuse such practise, , or shew himself reconciled to Image-worship? We do not finde he recall'd it in his *Retractations*: but we finde * him blaming the *Manichees* in that *they would seem to favour Images, for gaining the good will of the Pagans to their mad sect.* Again we finde him in his first book against the *Academicks*, pronouncing in general, *Nothing is at all to be worshiped, but to be cast away, What ever is seen with mortal eyes, and what ever any sense can reach:* This Book indeed he wrote when he was newly converted: but when he wrote his *Retractations*, he was an aged Christian; there he repeats this sentence, not retracting it, but only explaining the word *Sense*, by saying he meant the *senses of the body, not of the minde.*

Aug. contra Adimant. c. 13. *Velle videri se favere simulachris, ut vesana secta Paganorum concilient benevol.*

Aug. contra Acad. l. 1. c. 1. *Nihil omnino colendum esse, totúmque abjiciendum quicquid oculis cernitur, quicquid ullus sensus attingit.*

Retract. l. 1. c. 1. *Est enim sensus & Mentis.*

Also we finde the very same Father in his Book of *true Religion*, denying it and saying (as we saw above Sect. 1.)

Aug. de vera Relig. c. 55. *Non est nobis Religio humanorum operum cultus, meliores enim sunt ipsi Artifices.*

Sect 1.) *Worship of Dead Men — or of Angels, is no part of our Religion* — So likewise denies he there, *that the worship of the works of mens hands is any part of Christian Religion*, and adds Reason for it, *because the workmen themselves are better then their works*,

We finde him also upon occasion of the Heathen-worship asking this question: *Who is he that adores or prayes beholding an Image, and is not so affected as to think he is heard by it?* Where he not only condemns the *practice*, but shews the *danger* of it in withdrawing the minde from that which is to be adored, and prayed to. Nor is this so easily to be turn'd off as the *Cardinal* would do it, by saying, *St. Aug. speaks of Images with supposal of the Heathen error*, as if he should say, *When any thinking the Image to be God* (as the Heathens did) *comes to adore and pray*; As if there were no danger of withdrawing the minde so, but in them that think the Image to be God; But all Heathens did not think so, as we shall see below, and St. *Aug.* puts his question generally of all; and subjoyns the example

Aug. in Ps. 113. *Quis adoret vel orat intuens simulachrum, qui non sic afficitur ut ab eo se exaudiri putet?*

Bell l. 2. de Imag. c. 9. *Loqui de simulachris suppositio errore Gentilium: quando quis putet simulachrum esse Deum, & accedit ut adoret* —

of those that could not think the Image to be the thing it represented; but might see them different and distant one from the other at the same time, as the *Sun it self* and the *Image of it*. *They* (saith he) *that are engaged to such superstitions, do often turn their backs to the Sun it self, and pour out their prayers to the statue or Image of it*: and then St. *August.* tels us the danger of it, which is common to Heathen or Christians, that *will binde themselves to such superstition*; *Against this affection* (arising from the use of the Image) *wherewith humane infirmity may be easily taken, the Scripture cryes out*, telling them often, *They are the works of mens hands.* And a little after upon the same Psalm, shews the danger that arises, by reason of the similitude. The *likeness*, saith he, *which the Image hath to One living, much prevails upon the affections of silly miserable men.* And thus much out of St. *Aug.* against the *worship* of Images, and to shew the *danger* of using them in holy worship.

Aug. ibid. *Homines talibus superstitionibus obligati, ad ipsum solem plerumque dorsum ponentes, preces fundunt statuæ.*

Contrà hunc affectum quo humana infirmitas facile capi potest, cantat Scriptura— Aug. ibid.

Valet in affectibus miserorum similis viventi forma Aug. ibid.

Let us hear what St. *Gregory* Bishop of *Rome* saith: In his time (which was about 600 years after Christ) they were gotten into

into Churches, for the historical use that might be made of them, but not yet obtained any worship. *Serenus* Bishop of *Marseilles* had caused some Images to be broken, because he saw the people inclined to give them worship. *Gregory* Bishop of *Rome*, writes to him commending him, in that he forbad them to be worshiped, but not praising him for breaking them. The *Cardinal* answers with their usual limitation of worship. *That their Bishop forbad only the superstitious use of worshiping Images as Gods:* when as its plain to him that reads the Epistle, he *simply* forbids the *worship*, by such sayings, *Adorare omnibus modis devita*, by all waies possible avoid the adoring of them; and all the *use* he allows of them is *historical:* as appears by many passages in that Epistle, that speak that use the only reason of having and retaining them; as for example. *It is one thing* (saith he) *to adore, another thing to learn by the history of the Picture, what is to be adored.* Again, *They were not placed in the Church (ad adorandum) for worship*, but *(ad instruendas solummodo-) only* for *Instructing of the minds of the simple.* After this he advises *Serenus* to call his people together, and teach them,

Greg. Epist. l. 9. Ep. 9.

Bel. de Imag. l. 2. c. 16. —*Usum superstitiosum quo Imagines coluntur ut Dii.*

Aliud est adorare, aliud per Picturæ historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere. Greg. ibid.

that nothing made with hands is to be adored, because it is written Luc. 4. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*; and then to tell them: *Because thou didst see Pictures (which are for instruction of Ignorant people that they may learn the history) to gain worship*, therefore thou didst break them: *but now if ye will have them for instruction, for which they have been anciently made and used, ye may.* Thus he, and what more plain that the use of Images was only historical, not for worship?

Omne Manufactum non licet adorari, quia scriptum est, &c.

Quia Picturas quæ ad ædificationem — ut historiam discerent, transisse in adorationem videras — Si ad hanc institutionem ad quam factæ sunt, habere vultis — Greg. ibid.

That which the *Cardinal* brings (in the place above cited) as a proof of his Answer, comes short still of the point in hand; He alledges out of *Gregories* Epist. to *Secundinus*, that desired of him the Image of our Saviour; *I know thou desirest the Image, not that thou maiest worship it, as God: but for remembrance of the Son of God.* Now that limitation (as God) is added, not as now its used in the Church of *Rome*, to imply a *Religious worship* of inferiour rank is to be given to the Image: but

Greg. Ep. l. 7. Ep. 53. *Scio quod Imaginem salvatoris non ideo petis, ut quasi Deum colas, sed ob recordationem filii Dei* —

but becauſe anciently they knew no difference between *worſhipping a Creature*, and worſhiping it as God, that is, giving to it what belonged to God. That which follows there in St. *Gregory* ſounds a little harſher at firſt hearing, and ſpeaks a declimation then beginning. *And we truly* (ſaith he) *lye proſtrate before the Image of our Saviour, not as before a Divinity, but we adore him, whom by that Image we remember as born, or ſuffering, or ſitting in his throne:* Suppoſing this ſentence to be *Gregories*, and not inſerted (for there are ſome interpolations and additions in theſe Epiſtles, as it is conceived) it ſpeaks no *worſhip* given to the Image, but that the uſe of it is only *recordation*, as in the former ſentence too: for to worſhip *before* or *toward* ſuch a thing, as towards the *Ark*, *Temple*, *Altar*, does not infer that thing is worſhiped, or that it determines the worſhip objectively, but only circumſtantially; as * above; but when this is done *before* or *towards* an Image, though it may poſſibly be done without giving any worſhip to the Image, yet ſcarcely without *ſcandal* to others, hardly without *danger* to himſelf that doth it, as appears by what is ſaid above, eſpecially out of St. *Auguſt.* And truly if this proſtration.

Nos quidem non quaſi ante Divinitatem ante illam proſternimur. Sed illum adoramus quem per imaginem — recordamur.

* Chap. III. nu. 15.

tion was a cuſtome in St. *Gregories* time (though without fixing any worſhip on the Image, as we ſee by what he ſaid of the only uſe of images for hiſtory and recordation) we ſee in it a *beginning of declination* towards this Image worſhip, which began to be aſſerted in the following Age.

II. Excuſes made by the Heathens in defence of their Images from which our ſecond Evidence.

Our ſecond evidence, is from the pretences wherewith the Heathens excuſed their worſhipping of Images, which we finde recited and rejected by the Ancient *Apologiſts* and Writers for the Chriſtian faith: and thereby the ſinews of *Romiſh* worſhip proportionably upheld by ſuch pretences, cut in ſunder. It is the uſual anſwer of Romaniſts, that they worſhip them not as Gods, or *as having any divinity in them*, as the Council of *Trent* hath it: and the * *Cardinal* thinks himſelf much concerned, to ſhew the Heathens did think them to be, and worſhip them as Gods. All that he ſaith from Scripture or Fathers for it, can but ſpeak of the groſſer ſort of Idolaters; but thoſe that were * *purgationis Religionis*, of a more *refined Religion*, as they took themſelves to be, had that and other excuſes. Its plain by what *Celſus* the Philoſopher pleads, and for it cites *Heraclitus*, who pronounced of them, that ſo offered

*Bel. l. 2 de Imag. c. 13.

* Aug. in Pſ. 113.

Origen. l. 7. contra Celſum.

fered their prayers to Images, (*viz.* as to Gods) that they did not know what the Gods or Heroes were. Alſo, *Origen* repeats it as ſpoken by the Adverſary: *Who, but a fool, will think them to be Gods, and not rather Statues dedicated to the Gods?* And *Arnobius* brings them in replying, *they did by Images worſhip the Gods*, therefore held them not Gods. Compare with this what the *Trent* Council ſaith. —*Not that any Divinity is believed to be in them:* and *that by Images before which we uncover, and lye down, we may worſhip Chriſt.*

Quis niſi totus fatuus hæc Deos eſſe credit——

Arnob l. 6. contra Gentes. *Deos per ſimulachra veneramur.*

Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 24. *Non quòd credatur ineſſe in iis aliqua Divinitas*—— —*ita ut per Imagines*— *Chriſtum adoremus.*

Lactantius alſo tels us what they uſed to reply, *We fear not*, (ſay they) *the work of mens hands, theſe Images; but thoſe we fear, to whoſe Names they are conſecrated.* Theſe men could not think them or worſhip them as Gods— and if they did not fear them, neither did they put *their truſt in them:* which is another thing, that the Council ſaith in excuſe of Image-worſhip— *Not that confidence or truſt is to be put in them:* and we may ſee by *Arnobius*, (as above cited nu. 1.) that they could profeſs they hoped for help from

Lactan l. 2. 2. *Non timemus opera digitorum ſimulachra, ſed eos*— —*Vel quòd fiducia in illis ſit collocanda.* Concil. Trid. ibid.

Arnobius l. 6. contra Gentes.

from the Deity: upon which he infers it as a great absurdity and perverseness, *ad effigiem—— to supplicate to an Image that hath no sense*, if thou expectest help from, and trustest in the Deity. This reason touches all Image-worship; and so doth that which *Lactantius* replies to their saying above—If you fear not Images, but those to whose Names they are dedicated: *Why lift ye up not your Eyes to Heaven? and what mean these Images of the Dead and Absent; for if absent they are not to be worshipped; if they hear not what we pray nor see what we do.* Let *Romanists* consider whether this spoken to Heathens doth not concern them.

Lact. l. 2. c. 2. *Cur ergo oculos ad Cœlum non tollitis? quid simulachra volunt mortuorum, & Absentium Monumenta! Et si absentium, non sunt colendi, si nec vident quæ facimus, nec audiunt qui precamur——*

To these I will but add two replies we meet with in St. *August.* repeated as from the mouth of Heathens. *I neither worship the very Image, nor a Devil, but in the Corporal representation I look upon the sign of that thing, which I ought to worship.* And in another place, *I do not worship that stone, or that Image which is without sense, but I adore what I see, and serve him.*

Aug. in Ps. 113. *Nec simulachrum colo—— Sed per effigiem—— Ejus rei signum intueor quam Colere debeo.*

Aug. in Ps. 96. *Non illum Lapidem, aut simulachrum colo quod est sine sensu, sed adoro quod video, & servio ei quem non video.*

him whom I do not see. Thus could the Heathens plead and profess, in excuse of their worshiping Images. The *Romanists* had need study and give out some new pretences. I will close this point with the consideration of one chief Cause of *Image-worship*, that which made it be so readily intertained, and so tenaciously held, as among the Heathen, so proportionably in the Church of *Rome*, and that is satisfaction of sense or sight: So in *Arnobius* by applying to their Statues, they conceited an enjoyment of their Gods as *present*, by praying to their Images, they did as it were *talk with their Gods.* And for this, they objected to the Christians that * they *could not shew* or *see* the God they worshiped. To this *satisfaction of sense* in Religion, belongs that of *Lactantius*; *The beauty of these Images dazles the eyes, neither do they think there is any Religion, where those do not shine and appear.* Were not these words spoken by so ancient a Father, one would think them spoken of the present Church of *Rome.*

Arnob. l. 6. contra Gentes. *Praesentiam quandam exhiberi*—

* Minutius Felix in Octavio. *Deum suum nec ostendere possunt nec videre.*

Lact. l. 2. c. 7. *Horum pulchritudo perstringit oculos, nec ullam Religionem putant, ubicunque haec non fulserint.*

Our

III. The plea made for Image-worſhip weak; and the pleaders unfaithful in their Allegations.

Our third Evidence is from the Inevidence or weakneſs of the proof, that can be made by the Adverſary for Image-worſhip. For that which they pretend to bring from before the ſeventh Age of Century, is either out of forged writings; or if out of true Authors, the words are perverted, or the argument made from them inconſequent, as to the worſhip of Images. This will appear if we examine the Collection which the *Cardinal* has made, or rather ſome careleſs Scribe for him, but He too blame-worthy, that would not better inquire into them, or think that others would not.

Bel. l. 2. de Imaginib. c. 12. ſect. primò.

Firſt he makes a ſemblance of proof from St. *Hierom* in his Epiſt. to *Marcella*, where he invites her to *Bethlem*: ſaying *the Tabernacle was venerable for the Cherubins*— But no ſuch words in that Epiſtle; Indeed in an Epiſtle of *Paula* and *Euſtochium* to invite *Marcella* to *Bethlem*, there is ſuch a thing but not the words of *Bellarmine*: *The Jewes* (ſay thoſe Women) *worſhiped or reverenced the Holieſt of Holies, becauſe there was the Cherubins, Ark, Aarons rod: and doth not the Sepulchre of the Lord ſeem to thee more venerable?* So the ſentence

Venerabantur Judæi Sancta Sanctorum, quia ibi erant— Nonne venerabilius tibi videtur Sepulchrum Domini?

tence or words are not *Hieroms*, *but* e *Womens:* nor are they their words ither as *Bellarm.* repeats them. But them go as he would have them, the gument for Image-worſhip is altoge- er inconſequent, from that reverence e Jewes gave towards the Temple or e Ark.

He ſubjoyns immediately, a Teſtimo- y out of St, *Aug.* who in his third Book *Trin. c.* 10. *Speaking certain ſignes which de- rve veneration as things rtaining to religion, puts r example there the bra- n Serpent.* St. *Aug.* there gives other examples as well as the bra- en Serpent, as the *Stone* which *Jacobs* ead lay upon, when he had the Vi- ion, *Gen.* 28. but becauſe the brazen erpent was an Image, this muſt be men- oned, as alſo in the next teſtimony, hough falſly there, and impertinently here; for the brazen Serpent was not n Image of Chriſt but a Type or Sign s St. *Aug.* has it, and upon that ſcore there was an *honour* due to it, as to all other ſigns of Gods inſtitution: but when *religious worſhip* was given to it by burning of Incenſe, (which is alſo done in the *Romiſh* worſhip before Images) it was

—Loquens de quibuſdam ſignis, quæ venerationem tanquam religioſa merentur, ponit pro exemplo ſerpentem æneum : Bell. ubi ſupra.

—hæc honorem ut Religioſa poſſunt habere. So St. Aug.

was broken in pieces. To this the Cardinal there * adds another place of St. Aug. and thus brings it in, *concerning the Images of the Cherub. and of the brazen Serpent, that they are to be honoured appears by St Aug.* in his third Book *de doctr. Christiana, c. 9. Where he saith, Signs appointed of God are venerable, because the honour of them redounds to the Prototype; and they were the Images of the Cherubins and of the Serpent:* having thus repeated St. *Aug* words, as he saw fit, he makes his argument from thence: *If it was lawful to worship the Images of Angels, why not of the Saints?* But first this has a false ground, *viz. that the Jewes worshiped the Cherubins,* * as above shewed that they did not. Again, from the veneration or reverend respect given to the holy signs instituted of God to infer *Romish* worship given to Images, is inconsequent upon a double account, because such veneration is of the weakest sort of honor, far short of the worship contended for; also because there is great difference twixt holy signs instituted of God, and Images of mans invention; and so from that looking towards or bowing towards the

* Bel. ubi suprà. *Tam de Imaginibus Cherubinorum, quàm Serpentis æneι quod honorari debuerint, patet ex Regula Augustini, signa divinitus instituta esse venerandα quia honor eorum ad prototypum transit. Fuisse autem illæ Imagines Cherubin. & Serpentis.*

* Chap. III. nu 10.

e Temple or Ark uſed by the Jewes to
er Image-worſhip, is inconſequent and
s upon the former reſpects, and alſo
ecauſe a *circumſtantial* determining of
orſhip given to God, this way ra-
er then another, as towards the Ark or
emple, is far different from the *objective*
ermining or receiving of the worſhip
an Image doth. But indeed, the *Car-*
inal wrongs St. *Aug.* both in his words
d meaning. For St. *Aug.* doth not
here deliver a Rule, nor ſaith as the *Car-*
inal ſets it down, but only by the way
ith, *He that reverenceth*
gns appointed of God (he
eans the Jewiſh Types be-
ore Chriſt.) *does not reve-*
rence theſe but that to which
all theſe had reference: where
his reverencing of ſuch a ſign, is ſo to
egard it, as to underſtand it in the ſpi-
itual meaning of it, as it is plain there
y St. *Aug.* who has no ſuch thing, as
the honour of the ſign or Image redoun-
ding to the prototype, nothing of the *Images*
of the Cherubins or Serpent: as the *Car-*
inal made him to ſpeak. The purpoſe
and meaning alſo of the Father is far
from giving any countenance to Images,
and its worthy our hearing. He ſhewed

Aug. de doctr. Chriſtiana l. 3. c. 9. *Qui veneratur utile ſignum divinitus Inſtitutum: non hoc veneratur, ſed illud potiùs quò talia cuncta referenda.*

in

in the chapters before, how the Gent did serve under *unprofitable signs*, i. their Statues and Imag for *some of them did not wo ship them as Gods, but interpret or call them Signs of the Gods.* (this m be added to the testimoni above, that Heathens could say in excu of their worship, that they did not ho their Images which they worshiped to Gods.) Then St. *Aug.* shewes how th Jewes were under *profitable signs institu ted of God.* Now the Gospel freed both the Gentiles by removing wholly tho unprofitable signs, and bringing them *the worship of the One God*; but freed th Jewes by bringing them *to those things of which they had before bu the signs.* Then he shewe we Christans, *are not bur dened with the heavy obser vance and toil of such Signs or Ceremonies. But we have few for many*— and those *most chaste in their observance* (whereas Images expo sed to worship are every where marked out as things tending to spiritual forni cation) and these few Signs are *Baptism* and the *Lords Supper*; none else are named by that Father. He should have excepted

Aug. de Doctr. Christiana l. 3. c. 8. — *Aliqui eorum non tanquam Deos venerabantur simulachra, sed tanquam signa Deorum interpretari conantur.*

—*ad unius Dei cultum.*

—*ad eas res quarum illa signa sunt, liberavit. Signorum operatione gravi non sumus onerati,— Sed pauca pro multis— observatione Castissima.*

cepted *Images* as *Signs*, with the obervance of which, the Church of *Rome* vily burdens her people; we ſhall ſee ently the *Cardinal* making him to ept them, where he intended no ſuch tter.

But becauſe thoſe Signs, which St. *Aug.* ſpeak of, were *inſtituted of God*, there-e the *Cardinal* thought himſelf bound ſay as much for *Images*; elſe would all impertinent; and he ſaies it boldly the ſame chapt. where he repeats eſe places of St. *Aug.* again). *Now that Images of the Saints are profitable ngs inſtituted of God, ap-ers by St.* Aug. *in his* 2. *ok of Chriſtian doctrine,* 25. How doth it appear? ecauſe ſpeaking of *Pictures d Statues*, he ſaith, **This kinde may be numbred ong the ſuperfluous inſti-ions of men: thoſe being cepted, which for a good d are in their due place and e propounded by them that ve Authority**; as if St. *Aug.* were cauoning here for images dedicated and ſet up by the Biſhop for Worſhip; but here (as I ſaid above) the *Cardinal* makes the good Father *except* what he never intended:

Bel. de Imag. l. 2. c. 12. ſect. Auguſt. *Quòd autem Imagines Sanctorum ſint utilia ſigna divinitus inſtituta patet ex —*

* *Totum hoc genus inter ſuperflua hominum inſtituta numerandum: exceptis iis quæ ob finem bonum, ſuo loco & tempore proponuntur ab eo qui autoritatem habet.* Sic Bel.

tended: for that *exception* is none of h
and its ſtrange the *Cardinal* would
thus abuſed by his Collector, or th
abuſe his Reader. The purpoſe of S
Aug. in the whole chap. is to ſpeak
the *Signs* inſtituted amongſt men for c
vil uſe of Society, The title of the cha
ter is * *Humane Inſtitutions.* To the
Signs he firſt reduces the Actions an
Geſtures of the *Pantomimi* or cunnin
Players on the ſtage, by thoſe Signs re
preſenting any Perſon; Then he name
Pictures and Statues as Signs by whic
things and perſons are ſignified; the
follows; *This whole kind (viz.* of *Action*, and *Pi
ctures) may be numbred a
mong the ſuperfluous Inſti
tutions of men, except whe*
(the exception *Bell.* puts
on him was clean another
thing) *it concerns upon conſideration o
occaſion, time, place, and the Authori
ty inſtituting or Commanding it*, Such
he preſently names and cals, *Conveni
ent and neceſſary Inſtitutes,
which in Apparel or habit
of body ſerve for diſcerning
ſexes, honours, or the like;
without which humane ſocieties can hard
ly conſiſt or be well held.*

* *Inſtituta humana.*

Sic **Aug.** *Totum hoc ge
nus inter ſuperflua homi
num inſtituta numerandum,
niſi cum intereſt, quid eo
rum, & qua de cauſa, &
ubi, & quando, & cujus
autoritate—*

*Commoda & neceſſaria in
ſtituta, quæ in habitu &
cultu corporis—*

One

One place more the *Cardinal* adds; here becauſe St. *Aug.* in the tenth book of his *Confeſſ. cap.* 34. hath theſe words —*in pictures tranſ-greſſing moderate and ne-ceſſary uſe and pious ſignifi-cation*: from which words is taken out of the midſt of a ſentence, and ſevered from thoſe that went be-fore, and follow after, the *Cardinal* infers, *Here St. Auguſt. reprehends the Painters* and ſhews *that ſome Images are of neceſſary uſe, ſome pious ſignification*: what boldneſs is this, thus ſtill to abuſe the *Father* and the Reader? The Title of that Chapter is, *the Allurements of the eyes, (Oculorum illecebræ)* and accordingly the Father complains, that *men have added much to the allurements of the eyes, in apparel, ſhooes, furniture, and ſuch kinde of workmanſhips, ſo in pictures and ſuch figments, all tranſ-greſſing the neceſſary, and moderate uſes of pious ſignification.* So that he no more reprehends *the Painters* (as the *Cardinal* confines it) then the *Shooe-makers*, or any other *Artificers* that ſerve to ſet out this luxury and exceſs; But what's that *pious ſignification*, which the *Cardinal* thinks proper to *Images only*? what elſe but that

St. Aug. l. Confeſ. 10. c. 34. hath it thus: *In veſtibus, calceamentis, Vaſis, & hujuſmodi fabricationibus, in Picturis —& figmentis uſum neceſſarium & moderatum; Et piam ſignificationē tranſ-gredientibus, addiderunt ho-mines ad illecebras oculo-rum.*

that moderation and sobriety which *becomes those that profess godliness*, 1 Ti 2. 10. and is seen in *apparel*, *ornament furniture*, and many things they use o have about them, as well as in Picture These places out of that Father, I hav the longer insisted on: partly to shew how destitute the *Romanists* are of proo in this point, how unfaithful in pretendin of them; partly to lay open the profita ble instruction which that Father deliver in these places: nothing indeed to Image worship, as the *Cardinal* would have it.

Bel. ibid. ex Ambr. *Qui coronat Imaginem Imperatoris, illum honorat cujus est Imago, qui contempserit statuam Imperatoris, ille feciſſe injuriam videtur, &c.*

One more example of the *Cardinal* unfaithfulness. He alledges in the sam chapt. the Testimony of St. *Ambr.* ou of his 10. *Serm.* upon the 118. Psalm. *He that Crowns the Emperours Image, honour him, whose Image it is: he that contemn the Emperours Statue, seems to do him in jury*, &c. Thus the *Cardinal* and no more: thinking every one would imagine, the application of this concerned the Image of Christ and the Saints; that the honour or contempt done to the Image would redound to the Prototype; but the words before and after plainly shew, that the Fathers intent there is to apply it not to *material*, but *living Images*, poor men especially, to whom if any do wrong, God takes it as done to himself, as

Mat.

do good to them Christ takes it as
to himself, as *Mat.* 25. 40. and
fir them up to charity, *how many*
ages of Christ (saith he) *do we*
ly walk among? and so have oppor-
nity of doing good. But it is usual
ith the *Romanists*, where ever they
et with this Instance of honour redoun-
ng to Emperors or Kings when done
their Statues: or with that General
ying, the honour done to the Image
ounds to the Prototype: they lay
d on it as an argument for Image-
orship: This they learn from their *Ni-*
e Council, which after the Seventh
e laid the foundation of this Image-
orship. There besides many misap-
ications of Scripture and Fathers, this
one: And *Athanasius*, *Basil*, and
yssen. ancient and learned Fathers
tended; who did indeed in proving
e Son to be worshiped with the Fa-
er, because he was *his expres's Image*,
e that *Instance* of honour done to the
perors Image, and that *General say-*
, of honour done to the Image re-
nding to the Prototype: as most
ainly appears in St. *Basil*. Now what
dness is this to transfer to the wor-
p of material Images, that which the
thers spake of Christ the Image of the

Quot inter Imagines Christi ambulamus? Ambr. ibid.

Bas. de Spiritu Sanct. cap. 18.

Father, because to the illustrating of it they took instance from the Civil worship.

One place more I must take notice of which the Cardinal alledges, and truly out of St. *Hierom* concerning *Paula*. *That lying prostrate before the Cross, as she had seen the Lord hanging there, she adored.* We must consider *Paula* is here visiting those very places at *Jerusalem* where our Saviour suffered and was buried: and if she was more then ordinarily *affected* and made such outward expressions of it, as St. *Hierom* relates of her, it is not much to be marvelled at: *Going into the Sepulchre she kissed the stone which the Angel had removed, and licked the place where our Saviours body laid:* So *before the Cross she lay prostrate*, adoring the Lord that hung upon it: This may be done without giving the Cross it self any Worship: as above noted, in the like place out of St. *Gregory*: If *Paula* transported in affection, did exceed: she is not therein an example to us: St. *Hierom* doth not say she gave worship to the Cross, or that it was her practise thus in her devotions to lie prostrate before the sign, but only tels us how she was affected in those very places.

Bel. l. 2. de Imag. c. 12. *Prostrata ante Crucem quasi pendentem Dominum cerneret, adorabat.*

Ingressa sepulchrum— osculabatur— ore Lambebat— Hieronym. in vita Paulæ.

I will conclude with the dangerous inconveniences of this Image-worship, which even their own Authors complain of. *Images* at first brought in for better remembrance of the History, and to teach ignorant people what they could not read, after once they began to be worshiped, became ill Teachers of those idle Scholars: who could not well distinguish what and how they worshiped: *Polydore* speaking of it, complains thus: *O such a madness is it* [...] *Many of the Ruder and ignorant sort, so worship, that they trust in them more then in Christ, or the Saints represented by them; and adding folly to folly, they offer gold and silver unto the Images. And that they may be the better enticed to do it, they that reap the profit by it* (the cunning Priests) *hang up some of those Gifts and offerings to be seen.* * *Cassander* gives many other complaints, made by *Gerson*, and *Gabriel Biel*— of the poor simple people led on hereby to superstitious if not Idololatrical misconceits and practises. But enough of this.

IV. Complaints of the inconveniences of this *Romish* practise.

Polyd. de Invent. Rerum l. 6. c. 13. *Eò insaniæ devenum est— Permulti rudiores— —stultitiâ stultitiam cumulantes— —Illi qui talem proventum merunt.*

* Cassand. in Artic. 21.

SECT. IV.

Of Justification.

1. Romanists make a confused work of this doctrine.

BY that which was said above Chap. IV. It may in some measure appear what a confused work the *Romanists* make of this doctrine of *Justification*, and with what difference from St. Paul's meaning, and from his way of handling it.

Decret. c. 7. *Non est sola remissio peccatorum sed etiam Sanctificatio.*

For first to settle the Justification of a Sinner upon inhærent righteousness they confound *Justification* and *Sanctification*. The *Trent* Decree saith, *It is not only Remission of Sins, but also Sanctification.* *Justification* indeed and *Sanctification* go together, yet are they to be distinguished, as very different Acts and communications of divine grace, the Apostle distinguished them expressly, saying * 1 Cor. 6. 11. * *but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified* and 1 Cor 1.30. *who is made unto us — Righteousness, and Sanctification.*

Remission & deletion of sin.

Secondly, They deny not, that Remission of Sin is Justification, but confound that *Remission*, (which according to Scripture and Fathers, stands in the forgiveness of the offence and punishment) with the actual *deletion* or expunging of the stain

ain and corruption of sin that is in us: which is another thing from Remission and forgiveness. And when Scripture expresseth Remission by *blotting out* or deletion: as *Isa.* 43. 25. *Psal.* 51. 9; is the blotting our sins out of Gods *Book* of remembrance, not out of the *tables* of our heart; It is as much, as God will remember them no more, no more impute, or lay them to our charge. As for the blotting or purging the stain and corruption of Sin out of the Soul: though it be not done *by Remission*, but by another act of grace; yet we grant, it is done *with Remission* in the justifying of a sinner; and inhærent Righteousness (by which that stain of sin is done out, and the dominion of sin broken) is wrought in the Soul, together with the righteousness of Justification.

Thirdly: Having made a distinction of their Justification into *First* and *Second*: that by inhærent habitual Righteousness, This, by *actual* or continuance in well-doing, they usually confound their first & second Justification, in the proving & commending their doctrine of *Justification by Works*. And when they are put to it, in plain terms to speak what they mean by *Justification by works*; they restrain it to that which they call the *second Justification*. The first and second Justification.

fication; in the explaining whereof the Council of *Trent* saith nothing, which contraries the Protestant Doctrine, saving that it cals that Justification, which is not so, according either to Scripture or Fathers. Of this second and improper Justification, we spoke * above, and shewed how it brings the Controversie of *Justification by Works* to nothing, if indeed they would pretend to no more by their second Justification, then their *Council* seems to make of it. So that we might spare farther labour in calling them to shew what proof they have for this doctrine *of Justification by Works*, in Scripture and Antiquity; And as for their *first Justification*, by inhærent habitual Righteousness, it is not concerned in this question of *Justification by Works*: that Righteousness being Gods *work*, not ours at all, as they do acknowledge; yet, because we were in the former Treatise (chap. 4.) bound up by Mr. *Spencers* Replies to say only, what he gave occasion for, it will not be amiss for a fuller clearing of that, wherein they and we do differ, to enter a farther consideration, of *Inherent Righteousness*, of *Faith* and of *Works*, as to this point of *Justification*. By which it will appear, They lay too much upon the *Inherent*, and are too much

* Chap. IV. nu. 2, & 5.

...ch afraid of an *imputed* Righteousness: ...o that they give *Faith* too little in this ...ness, and are needlessly afraid of the ...da Fides, Faith only: Lastly that they ...eak too confusedly, when they say and ...ve out, Men are *justified by Works*.

1. For *inherent Righteousness*: The question being, *by what Righteousness we are justified before God?* We must in the first place draw from them the acknowledgement of some Truths: Such as they indeed are loath readily to profess and plainly to speak out, but such as are necessary for understanding this Question; as to the two Terms in it, *Justification* and *Righteousness*.

II. Of Inherent Righteousness, as to Justification.

The first Truth is this, That *Justification* speaks opposition to *Condemnation*, as *Rom.* 8. 33, 34. and stands primarily in the *acquitting* of a sinner from the guilt of his sin (offence, and punishment) the *remission*, or not *imputing of his sin*, the *reconciling* of him to the favour of God; and according to this importance or sense, the Apostle St. *Paul* continually speaks of it. The definition or description which the * *Trent* Council gives of Justification is this: *It is nothing else but a Translation from the state of the Sons of* Adam, *into the Adoption of the Sons of God through Jesus Christ.* Here is no

Justification founds opposition to Condemnation.

* Decret. c. 4. *Justificationem: In iis non esse aliud quam translationem a statu filiorum Ade-*

mention of *Remission* of sins, but else where it is implied, they grant it, when they say, *Justification is not only Remission of Sins, but also Sanctification*: and a little after, *In Justification we receive faith, hope and charity, together with Remission of sins*: Here it is implyed that in *Justification* there is *remission* of sins; but since the *Jesuites* prevailed, it is made subsequent to the infused Righteousness which purges out the sin, and that with them is *Remission* of sin, or *Deletion* of it: for these they confound, as above noted; and are loath to express *Remission* of sin, as the Scripture doth, *by not imputing of sin*.

Decret. c. 7. *Non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed etiam sanctificatio.* — *In ipsa Justificatione una cum Remissione peccatorum, fidem, spem & charitatem accipientes.*

Of the Grace of God taken for his Favour and Love.

A Second Truth, which they are not so willing to profess, is, That by the *Grace* of God, to which we finde Justification and Salvation often ascribed, is meant the Favour, Love, or good Will of God towards Man; I do not say, they deny such an acception of *Grace*, for the *Trent* Council condemning those that say, *the Grace by which we are justified, is only the Favour of God*: doth imply it to be of the Grace and favour of God that we are Justified; and their Writers, when put to it, will acknowledge *Grace* so

Concil. Trid can. 11.

taken

but decline so to interpret the Grace, where ever they can, holding out for it, the gift of grace inhærent in us.

A third Truth, they unwillingly profess and decline to speak of is: that there is an imputed righteousness, or that Christs righteousness is imputed to us for justification. Their Council acknowledges, * *Christ the meritorious cause of Justification* which doth closly imply this Truth, *viz.* the application or imputation of his satisfaction or Merits to us for justification; and this imputation is mentioned, when in that * Council they are Anathematiz'd, that say: *Men are justified by the only imputation of Christs righteousness.* And we shall have occasion below to shew how the *Cardinal* admits of this Imputation; in one place, with a *Non est absurdum— It is not absurd to say, Christs righteousness and merits are imputed to us, as if we our selves had satisfied*; It seems we are but lightly concerned in this great Truth of the Imputation of Christs righteousness for justification: but deny it they cannot. Of Imputed Righteousness. * Decret. c. 7. * Canon. 11. Bel. l. 2. de Justific. c. 10.

A fourth Truth is: That inhærent Righteousness is imperfect and weak both in the habit or first infusion, and also in the working; This they would fain decline Inhærent Righteousness imperfect.

cline as prejudicial to Justification by i
but they must and do acknowledge th
Truth, as we shall see below.

Indeed these Truths have not been
readily professed, since the *Jesuites* pr
vailed: whose study seems not to be fo
Truth and *Peace*, but to set every poi
of doctrine farther off from agreemen
Yet notwithstanding all the devices an
endeavours of such dissemblers of Truth
and enemies of Peace, we gain by the for
mer Truths, this Evidence for clearin
the Doctrine of *Justification of a Sinner*
That it is a not-imputing of his sin, an ab
solving or acquitting him from his sin
and the condemnation due to them,
reconciling of him or receiving him int
Gods favour, an accepting of him in th
beloved, through the imputation o
Christs satisfaction and merits, apprehen
ded by Faith. Also that albeit Inhæren
Righteousness be at the same time given
by which the sinner is made righteous al
so, and truly righteous according to that
measure of righteousness: yet is all the
righteousness inhærently in him too
weak and imperfect for his justification,
(his appearing and standing in judg-
ment) he needs the righteousness of
Christ to make a supply of what is want-
ing, and to cover what is amiss.

What Justification is and wherein properly it stands.

Contaremus

Contaremus, a Cardinal of *Rome*, and writer against *Luther*, was in this point clearly *Protestant*, convinced of the forc- Truth and expressing it; as we shall by his words below rehearsed.

But now let us see what work they III. make, in that Church, with the doctrine of *Inherent Righteousness*: and what they bring from Scripture or Fathers to make Inherent Right. Habitual and Actual. seem Catholick.

Inherent Righteousness, they distinguish into *Habitual*, which is by infusion of grace, and *Actual*, which is acquired by works; and here they are not agreed, whether a sinner be made formally righteous by the *Habitual*, or by the *Actual* righteousness, or by both together? for the *Cardinal* acknowledges *their Doctors dispute it, but*, saith he, *all agree, that it is a true inherent righteousness* (by which we are made righteous formally) *not the imputed righteousness of Christ*. How their *Catholick Doctors* agree in this we shall examine presently. But first see, how the *Cardinal* declares. He professeth in the same place, that his judgement is for the * *Habitual* as infused, and answers the places of Scripture which are alledged by

* Bel. l. 2. de Justif. c. 15: *An sit Habitualis an Actualis an utraque: De hac re disputant Catholici Doctores: Sed conveniunt in eo omnes, ut sit in nobis vera justitia inhærens, non autem Christi justitia imputata.*

* *Solam habitualem esse, per quam justi formaliter sumus.* ibid.

by those that plead for the *Actual* also; where we may note, that the places of Scripture, here alledged for the *Actual* righteousness against the *solam habitualem* the *habitual only*, are the very same which they usually bring for *works*, against *solam fidem*, *Faith only*: and the Answers which the *Cardinal* returns to them, may serve us to exclude works from the true Justification. The places and answers briefly are these.

Bel. l. 2. de Justific. c. 16.

Rom. 2. 13. *The doers of the Law shall be justified*: The *Cardinal* answers out of S. *Aug.* They shal be adjudged or declared just, in the Divine Judgment; St. *James* c. 2. 24. *By works a man is justified*: The *Cardinal* answers out of the Council of *Trent*, *which interprets that place of the second justification, in as much as by good and just works the increase of habitual justice is merited.* Lastly, 1 *Jo.* 3. 7. *He that doth righteousness is righteous*: The *Card.* answers, the Apostle doth not speak what makes a man formally just, but that whereby a man may be known to be just. By this it appears how the *Cardinal* removes the *Actual righteousness of Works*, from that which they hold to be the first and true, and proper Justification; much more are they removable from the formality of that which

we

hold the true and proper Justification, cording to the doctrine of St. *Paul*.

Now let us examine whether they *all* (as the *Cardinal* boasted) upon the righteousnes, against the *impu-* First see what *Vasquez* and *Bellar-* two great Defenders of inherent ghteousnes and the perfection of it, are ced to grant about the Imputation of Christs Righteousnes. *Vega* had said (as *Vasquez* notes and corrects him for it) *Divine providence ordered it so, that the Fathers used not the word of Imputation, lest they should seem to give occasion to the Heretick's of these daies, for their Error of false Imputation:* He was not afraid it seems of the Apostles giving them occasion and warrant for the Doctrine of *Imputation*. But *Vasquez* acknowledges the Fathers did use that word, and other words æquivalent, as *Communication* and *Application*. And he grants, *that the merits and obedience of Christ are imputed to us, as if indeed they were ours:* and he giveth a good Reason: *Because the merits of Christ are the Merits of our Head.* This is fair, and enough for our purpose, if he did not pull back what he had given out; and restrain, what he had freely and truly granted; Therefore he

IV. Concessions of Romanists about imputation.

Vasq. in 1. 2. Disput. 222. cap. 1.

Concedimus imputari nobis Merita & obedientiam Christi — ac si revera essent nostra — ibid.

Dissentimus ab Hæreticis in eo, ad quod merita Christi existimamus nobis imputari. Dicimus imputari ratione Effectus, quo pacto loquitur Concil. Trid. etiam ad aliquem effectum imputari. ibid.

he subjoyns; *We differ from the Hereticks in that, which, or for which the Merits of Christ are imputed.* How is that? *We say they are imputed*, saith he, *by reason of the Effect, as the Council of* Trent *speaks: also that they are imputed as to some effect.*

Now if we ask, *to what effect?* He tells us in the two next chapters, They are imputed unto *Justification*, and unto *life eternal*: This is very true: But how unto *Justification?* In regard of the *dispositions*, and in regard of the *Form* of Justification: in as much as by or through the Merits of Christ grace prævenient and adjuvant is given to *dispose* us to Justification, and Inhærent Righteousness given, *formally* to justifie us. Thus he explains himself in the second chapter: and as for *remission* of sins by the satisfaction of Christ imputed, no mention of that: We must look for it in that *purgation* of sin which he supposes to be made by Infused Righteousness; for they usually confound *Remission*, and *Deletion* or purgation of sin, as above noted, nu. 1.

The *Cardinal* in his Concessions speaks a little clearer for *Remission* of our sins by the

Satisfaction and Merits of Christ imputed: reserving himself still for his inherent Righteousness, and having nothing to keep him off from the Protestant doctrine (which allows the being and necessity of Inhærent righteousness) but only the nicety of a Term *Formaliter*. For speaking of Protestants: *they would* (saith he) *have only Christs merits imputed to us, because they are given to us, and we may offer them to God the Father for our sake, because he undertook the burden of satisfying for us; their doctrine were right and sound. But so to have Christs righteousness imputed to us, as if by it we were formally just: is repugnant to right reason.* Well, we say the first which he cannot but approve: we do not say the other, for that *formally* just or justified, is their expression not ours.

* Bel. l. 2. de Justific. c. 7. *Si solum vellent imputari nobis Christi merita, quia nobis donata sunt, & possumus ea Deo patri offerre pro peccatis nostris, quoniam Christus suscepit onus satisfaciendi pro nobis, recta esset eorum sententia.*

Again, *Although by inherent Righteousness*, saith he, *we are truly denominated, and made righteous: yet do we not by that satisfie God, for our sins and eternal punishment.* Therefore it is not absurd to say, Christs merits and righteousness is imputed to us, as if

Bel. l. 2. de Justific. c. 10. *Etiamsi per justitiam inhær— tamen per eam non satisfacimus Deo pro peccatis & pœna æterna— Non absurdum, &c.*

if we our selves had satisfied: so that be not denied, *there is besides an inhe righteousness in us*: we do not de there is: but affirm they ascribe t much unto it, and may observe ho careful the *Cardinal* is for this inhere Righteousness, but as for the *impute Non absurdum* will serve that; It is n absurdity to grant it.

There is one place more, where th *Cardinal* admits the Imputation Christs Righteousness, and that the sim litude of a *garment* (used by the Prot stants) may agree to it, in as much *Christs satisfaction for our sins is applied us, and reputed ours.* This is fair: bu then he adds in behalf of the *formality* his *inherent Righteousness*: *That a man should satisfie for another, is reasona ble: not that one should be formally just because another is so.* True, a man can not be therefore *formally* just, that is, *in herently* just, or as by an *inherent quali fication*; but why may he not be there fore (that is, for Christs satisfaction and righteousness imputed) accepted of God as just and righteous in the notion of Justification? that is, one to whose charge nothing can be laid, one reconci led, restored to favour, accepted to life eternal; And as *Bel.* said, *Christs satis faction*

Bel. de Justif. lib. 2. c. 11. *Nobis donatur & applicatur, & nostra reputatur.*

is reputed ours, he means *really*: why may not we thereupon be also re- *really* just and righteous, as to the ion or importance of Justification? if by that *satisfaction* and *righteous-* of our Saviour imputed we are *ac-* in our Justification from our *sins eternal death* (as the *Cardinal* gran- and so doth their *Trent* Council) should not a sinner so acquitted be accepted to *eternal life*, purchased by that satisfaction and righteous- imputed? *accepted*, I say, *to eternal* as to the first *Right*.

This may be inferred also from the of that Council, when it tels us (as had it * above) what Justification is: * Num. 2. *translation from the state of the Sons of into the Adoption of the Sons of through Jesus Christ*. Which though good definition, yet implies there is in tification a *remission* of sins and the demnation due to them; under which men lye while they are in the *state of Sons of Adam*. Again it implies, such sons acquitted of their sins, are receiv- into favour, as sons by *Adoption*, and gives *Right* in the same moment to *heavenly inheritance*. Lastly, that all through *Jesus Christ*; which implies the

the satisfaction and merits of Christ
plyed, imputed.

Other purposes of inherent Righteousness, then that we should be justified by it.

Now albeit *Inherent Righteousnes*
given, in Justifying of a sinner (as oft
said before) yet it is not given for the
malizing of Justification it self proper
taken, but as *consequential* to it, for q
lifying the subject answerably to t
which is received in *Justification*; F
there is *Remission* of sin as to the offen
and condemnation, therefore grace a
put into the Soul for doing away by d
grees the stain and corruption, and
breaking the dominion of Sin. There
also *Adoption* and receiving the person
a son of God, therefore Grace infus
for the *New-birth*, and as a *Principle*
New life and obedience; There is a
ceptation and *Right* to eternal life
heavenly inheritance, therefore gra
and inherent Righteousnes given for th
fitting and preparing of the Person to t
pursuit, obtaining and enjoying of i
We see other purposes of Inherent Righ
teousnes given us, then that we shou
be Justified by it.

Furthermore, that the accepting of u
as righteous in our Justification follow
immediately and is intrinsecally joyn
with Remission of sins, is plain by th
Apostl

...ille, *Ro.* 4. 6,7,8. telling us who are ...e, blessed ones to whom the Lord *im...h righteousness: even Those, to whom ...ll not impute sin.* And the similitude ...Garment, or of *Jacobs* wearing his ...r brothers cloathes to get the blessing ...the birth-right, (which the *Cardinal* ...ted appliable to the imputation of ...rists righteousnes to us) does imply ...re then *remission of sins*: Even the *ac...ing* of their Persons, and *receiving* of ...m as Sons unto the blessing. Also, ...t the Imputation of Christs righteous...s should not be confined (as the *Ro...ists* would have it or delight to ex...t it) to the bare importance of *satis...tion*: they might think it reasonable by ...t which they yield to the satisfactions ...f Saints appliable and *imputable* to ...hers. For when we urge (against that ...easure of their Church, and the ap...ying of it) that common judgment of ...e School, *Meritum non excedit Perso...m*, Merit exceeds not the Person, Christ ...ly excepted: They distinguish and con...der the good works and sufferings of ...e Saints, as *Satisfactory*, and as *Meri...rious*: and say as they are Meritorious, ...ey exceed not the Person, but as Satis...factory, they are imputable, appliable to ...thers. Which albeit said without ground

or

or warrant, might keep them from
straining thus the imputation of Chri
righteousness to the point of *satisfacti*
and allow it to be not only as *satisfac*
in the Justification of a Sinner, but
Meritorious also, to all effects and purp
ses, for compleating the act of Justificati
in the accepting of the Person as Right
ous, to whom it is imputed or applied.

We have seen what concessions a
made of the *Imputation* of Christs Ri
teousness, by those that are most for t
inherent, I mean the Jesuites: and ho
they lay too much upon the *inhere*
righteousness in the point of Justificatio
when the *Imputed* would bear it bette

V. Romish writers dissenting in the point of Justification by Inhærent Righteousness.

Now see what *Vasquez* (who has hand
led this doctrine of *Inhærent Righteousne*
most copiously and diligently) acknow
ledgeth touching their dissenting Au
thors, to the great prejudice of this thei
supposed Catholick Doctrine.

First * he acknowledges of *Duran*
and other Schoolmen, that they held
We are pleasing and accepted of God, before
he infuseth Grace, or inherent Righteous
ness. And that this gift of inherent
Grace, or habitual righteousness does not
necessarily arise from that acceptation of
God: but from the will of God appointing,
that every one who is to be brought to
eternal

* Vasq. in Thom. 1. 2. disput. 205. c. 1.

life should have it. This is that which we say; that albeit *inherent grace and eternal righteousness*, doth accompany and follow immediately upon *Divine Adoption*, yet it does not necessarily accompany or arise from it as to *justification*, but for other purposes (as noted before) one whereof and the main one is here mentioned, *viz.* the *bringing, preparing, fitting us to eternal life*: and is there approved by *Vasquez* himself; But for the former part of their Sentence that pronounces us *pleasing unto God*, and *accepted* of him unto Justification, by the imputation of Christs righteousness, antecedently to infusion of habitual righteousness: He saith, *it doth not a little favour the Heretiks of our dayes.* And in another place, speaking of the Imputation of Christs righteousness and merits, which the Protestants assert in Justification: he saith, *This kinde of Imputation or application of Christs Merits, all those Catholiks must acknowledge, that say, inherent righteousness renders us acceptable to God, not by its own nature and worth, but through the acceptation and favour of God. In like manner all those*

* *Non parum favere Hæreticis nostri temporis* Vasquez disp. 205. c. 2.

Vasq. in 1. 2. Tho. disp. 222. c. 2. *Hoc genus imputationis seu applicationis fateri debent quotquot ex Catholicis asserunt Justitiam— Similiter & illi qui censent qualitatem nobis inhærentem— Non purgare nos a peccatis nisi accedente nova voluntate & favore Dei condonantis peccata.*

must

must acknowledge it, that hold the qua-
ty which is in us, to be true righteousn
and sanctity, yet in its own nature not a
to purge us from our sins, without the s
peradding of a new will and favour of G
in pardoning sin. Of these he saith; W
they nill they, they are co-
pelled to grant a new imput-
tion of the Merits of Chri
for the remitting & pard-
ning of Sin. Why! the J

Velint nolint coguntur concedere novam imputationem meritorum Christi, ad remittenda & condonanda peccata. ibid.

The Brief of the Jesuites Doctrine of Justification.

suits allow the imputation or Applic-
tion of Christs Merits to this effect, th
inhærent grace or righteousness may b
given us, and then the whole work o
Justification is done by it; by it we ar
rendred acceptable to God, by it our sin
done away or purged out (which wit
them is the Remission of Justification
without a new imputation of Christs me
rits. This is the brief of the Jesuites do
ctrine of Justification.

VI. Imperfection of Inherent Righteousness.

But note we, out of *Vasquez* his ac
knowledgment newly recited; There ar
two sorts of their *Catholicks* that do ad
mit inhærent righteousness in some or
der to Justification; one in regard o
rendring us acceptable to God, but no
of it self but through the favour of God
and imputation of Christs Merits; The
other sort in regard of doing away sin;
which

ich it cannot do throughly, but still
ds the imputation of Christs Merits for
don. Both these acknowledge the
rfection of Inhærent Righteousnes,
upon that the necessity of Christs
teousnes imputed. Against both
e *Vasquez* * disputeth as against Ad- * Vasq. in
faries to their Inhærent Righteous- 1. 2. disp.
214. c. 3. §.

And to these all those Schoolmen
om *Vasquez* complains of, to have con-
red in this opinion, *That*
n is nothing in us, either
it or operation (*i. e.* ei-
er habitual or actual righ-
nes) *which of it self in*
own nature, can justifie
soul and purge it from
; but unto this it necessa-
ly needs the favour of God accepting it
viz. that righteousnes which is in us)
d pardoning or remitting the sin. To
ose Schoolmen he adjoyns *Victoria* and
anus, as agreeing with them. Also in
e next chap. *Vasquez* begins thus:
cannot but wonder at those
cient Schoolemen, that
ought so abjectly of inhæ-
rent righteousnes, as to fear
to ascribe unto it the true reason of righ-

Vasq. in 1. 2. disp. 204. c. 1. *In quam sententiam non pauci Scholastici conspirarunt— Nihil nobis inesse sive habitum, sive operationem quod suapte naturæ possit Justificare animam, & eam à peccatis purgare—*

Non possum non mirari Antiquos Scholast. quod tam abjectè de inhærente justitia senserint, ut veram ei—

teousnes

teousneſs; *But I much more wond* at our modern Divines, that after t Definition of the Council Trent, they ſhould grant weak and imperfect an inh rent righteouſneſs to juſt pe ſons: or to the Juſtifying them. *Both of theſe* (ſai he) *do take away the tr reaſon and effect of inhere rigteouſneſs,* (that is, as t juſtification by it) *whic the Fathers of the Council of Trent, d ſo much ſtrive to aſſert and defend.*

Multò magis recentiores Theologos, quòd poſt Concilii Trid. defin. tàm exilem juſtitiam inhærentem Juſtis conceſſerint.

—Veram rationem juſtitiæ inhærentis de medio tollunt: quam Patres Tridentini pro viribus ſtruere— Vaſq. diſp. 204. c. 2.

And yet more home in the next chap *Otherwiſe* (ſaith he) *I d not ſee, how we can declin their Tenet, that deny ou Juſtification to be made b inhærent righteouſneſs as t the Form of it,* that is, un leſs we aſſert the contrary to that, whic the forementioned Schoolmen and Di vines aſſerted. So that *Bellarmine* wa out, when he ſaid (as above noted) A their Doctors agreed upon the inhæren righteouſneſs, againſt the imputed; Cer tainly he knew the contrary, but *Vaſquez* was more ingenuous in acknow ledging it.

Aliquin non video quomodo declinare poſſimus eorum ſententiam, qui negant juſtitia inhærente tanquam forma fieri juſtificationem noſtram. Vaſq. ibid. c. 3.

Unto

unto all the former Witnesses, we must what *Pighius* and *Contarenus* say as this question between the *inhærent* and ted righteousness. *Pighius* out of saying of St. *Paul*, *Act.* 13. 38, 39. cludes that Justification stands in Re- sion of sins through Faith: *There-*

faith he, *to be justified, is: to have our sins mer- ly remitted of God in ist.* Again, from 2 *Cor.* 18, 19. he concludes: *him therefore we are ju- fied before God, not in our ves, not by our own righ- sness, but by his, which puted to us:* and from *Cor.* 5. *v.* 22. *We made the righteousness God in him*; *Pighius* concludes, We made the righteousness of God in ist Exclusively to all righteousness in selves. Also out of *Rom.* 5. *v.* 18, *By the righteousness of — by the obedience of one many made righteous:* he thers; *Thence it is that righteousness stands in rist's obedience, because for being incorporated into im, his obedience is accepted, as if it were rs; so that by it we also may be ac-*

VII. The acknowledgment of some late Romish Writers.

Pigh. controversia secunda. *Hoc ergo est justificari, peccata nobis misericorditer remitti à Deo in Christo.*

In illo igitur justificamur, non in nobis, non nostrâ justitiâ, sed illius justitia, quæ nobis imputatur. Non nostra sed Dei justitia in Christo ibid.

In Christi autem obedientia quòd nostra collocatur Justitia inde est, quod nobis illi incorporatis acst nostra esset accepta ea fertur, ità ut eâ ipsâ etiam nos justi habeamur. ibid.

counted righteous; and then adds the example of *Jacob* clothed with his elder brothers raiment to obtain the blessing.

Contarenus in his Tract of Justification, gives us first this distinction of Righteousness. *One*, saith he, *inhærent in us, the other not inhærent in us, but given us with Christ, the righteousness of Christ and all his merit*; and afterward he calls it the *Imputed righteousness*, and saith, *we attain to both sorts of Righteousness by faith.* Then he puts the question, *Upon which of these righteousnesses we ought to relye, or hold our selves justified before God and accounted righteous?* He concludes, *it must be upon the righteousness of Christ given us, not upon the Sanctity or Grace inherent in us:* and adds the Reason, *because that which is in us is but in choate and imperfect, which cannot keep us from offending often, and sinning daily, and therefore have daily need to say, Forgive us our Debts, therefore we cannot be accounted just in the sight of God*

Contar. de Justific. *Justitiam inhærentem— Et non inhær— Sed donatam nobis eum Christo, Christi (inquam) justitiam & omne ejus meritum.*

Ad utramq; attinginus per fidem.

Justitiâ Christi nobis donatâ, non autem Sanctitate & gratiâ nobis inhærente. ibid.

Inchoata & imperfecta, quæ tueri nos non potest, quin in multis offendamus, & assidue peccemus —

Idcirco in conspectu Dei non possumus ob hanc— —Est vera & perfecta justitia, quæ omnino placet oculis Dei, in qua nihil est quod Deum offendit.

…d, for this our righteousness: but the righteousness of Christ given to us, is the only true and perfect righteousness, which is altogether pleasing in the eyes of God, and in which there is nothing that offends him. Unto this the same Author applies *Phil. 3. 9. Not having mine own righteousness, but the Righteousness, which is through Faith*—— He gives us withall a good lesson; *It is found by experience,* (saith he) *that holy men, the more they advance in sanctity, the less are they pleasing to themselves, and the more do they understand, how they stand in need of Christ and his Righteousness given unto them; therefore they forsake themselves and relie upon Christ only.*

* ——*quanto magis in sanctitate proficiunt, tanto minùs sibi placere, & tanto magis intelligunt se indigere Christo, & justitia Christi sibi donata, ideóque se relinquunt & soli Christo incumbunt.* Contar. ibid.

He answers also to some places of Scripture objected: as, that the *Psalmist* saith often, *Judge me, O Lord according to my righteousness, and the Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness*—— *I have kept the waies of the Lord*—— *Psal.* 18. 20, 21. *If* David *had said and meant this so, as to think himself therefore justified before God, he had spoken as arrogantly as the Pharisee,*

— *ità ut putasset se propterea justificatum esse coram Deo*—

--Sed & essent mera mendacia.

Luc. 18. *Nay he had spoken mere lies*— All this was spoken *in regard of his Enemies, especially Saul and Absalom, of whom he had deserved well; and not in regard of his righteousness before God.* Also to that place of *Deut.* 6. 25. *It shall be our righteousness, if we observe all these Commandments*— he answers

* *Justitia nostra Legalis est custodire omnia, sed quia nullus servat omnia præcepta Legis, ergò sub maledicto omnes, ideoque omnes indigemus Christo--*

* *Our legal righteousness is to observe all*— *but because there is none, that keeps all the precepts of the Law, therefore all lye under the curse,* (or condemnation) *and all stand in need of Christ and his righteousness.* Thus that *Cardinal* was convinced of the Truth of the *Protestant* Doctrine in this point or question between *imputed* and *inherent* righteousness, acknowledging the imperfection of the *Inherent* as to its effect of Justifying, and that the imputed was to be relied on.

Antididagma, Tit. Justific.

We might to these add, what the *Colen* Divines in their *Antididagma*, or book opposed to the reformation endeavoured by *Hermannus* the Archbishop, do acknowlege, speaking of the *Causes of Justification*: That the righteousness of Christ, as it is *apprehended by Faith, imputed to us for righteousness*— and more to like purpose.

-- *Nobis imputatur ad justitiam, dum fide apprehenditur.*

Hitherto

Hitherto we have shewen by the foregoing witnesses, that this Romish Doctrine of inhærent Righteousness has not been *Catholick*, within that Church, nor so generally held among themselves, as they pretend.

VIII. Romanists destitute of Scripture in this point.

It is now time to look higher, and briefly examine what they bring from *Scripture* and *Antiquity* to make it seem (according to *Vincentius* Rule) *Catholick*. And by this trial it will still appear less worthy of that name.

The *Cardinal* brings * eight places of Scripture for justification by inhærent righteousness. Which might all be answered with this one exception: They may prove that there is an inhærent righteousness, but not that there is Justification by it. To instance in the chief of them: His first place, is *Rom.* 5. 19 — *Made sinners* really inhærently. We grant it true, and answerably *made righteous* by Christ, but were we made sinners only so by *Adams* disobedience, were we not also made so by imputation? the *Cardinal* himself acknowledges it, and then are we not also made righteous by imputation of the second *Adams* obedience? The *Cardinal* (as we saw * above) in three places acknowledges the imputation of Christs satisfaction and merits

* Bell. l. 2. de Justif. c. 3.

Bell. de Amiss. g. l. 5. c. 17. sect. itaque.

* Nu. 4.

for freeing us from the offence of sin and and the guilt of eternal death: and therefore from that condemnation under which we are by the first *Adams* disobedience. That *condemnation* the Apostle here *vers.* 18. sets against *Justification*, and so in this Antithesis *vers.* 19. between *made sinners* and *made righteous* must first stand good in regard of Condemnation, and Justification taken properly—— then between the inhærent depravation, and the inhærent Righteousness: Take what the Ancient Commentators here say is meant by *made sinners*. *Chrysost.* and after him *Oecumen.* and *Theophylact* to the like purpose— expounds it, *made subject to punishment*, and *condemned to death*, that's the first sense of *made sinners*, and unto that is *Justification* in the first and proper sense opposed.

Εἰς κατάκειμα. εἰς δικαίωσιν. ἁμαρτωλοὶ δίκαιοι.

Chrys. in locum ὑπόδικοι κολάσεως, κατάδικοι θανάτου.

The *Cardinals* second Testimony is *Rom.* 3. 24. Here he would finde all the Causes of Justification, and in the word *Grace* taken for inherent righteousness, he fixes the *Formal* Cause. That it is taken for the *gift of Grace* inhærent, and not for the *favour* of God, he would prove by the word, *gratis, freely*, which was enough to set out the *favour of God* and *his love* to Mankinde. But the *Cardinal*

Bel. quo supra.

Of Grace and Gratis.

Grot. here also is impertinent and his argument inconsequent: For the word, δωρεὰν, *gratis*, *freely*, is not put here to set forth the *true Cause* of our Justification (*viz.* * *Gods gracious favour*) so much as to exclude the *false Causes*, *viz.* any cause, desert, motive on mans part: *Freely*, that is, without any *price* paid by us, without any *Cause* given by us, or any *worth* in us. Thus *gratis* is taken in Scripture, and though it consequently implies *the mere favour and love of God*; yet where *grace* is added, as here, it is taken in the first respect, exclusively to any thing in us more then *faith* to believe that Grace and favour of God towards man. Hear what * *Ambrose* on the place, *Freely*, saith he, *because working nothing, nor making any returns to God, they are by faith alone justified through the gift of God*: also for the word *Grace*: *By his grace, because we are redeemed by Christ by the will of God*; that *will* of God appointing and sending his Son for our redemption, as he there explains it: and thereby expresseth the *favour* and good will of God. *Oecumenius* also interprets

δωρεὰν.

* τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι.

+ Ambr. in Ro. 3: *Gratis; quia nihil operantes nec vicem reddentes solâ fide justificati sunt dono Dei.*

Gratiâ Dei in Christo, quia voluntate Dei à Christo redempti sumus. ibid.

terprets the word *Freely* exclusively—— *Freely*, that is, *without any good deed and again, to bring nothing with us but faith*, and afterward, he shewes by the Apostle *all have sinned*, and therefore *freely justified bringing with them faith only*. Add St *August.* of this word *gratis*, God *freely gives, and freely saves, because he findes nothing, for which he may save, findes much for which he may damn.*

Oecum. in locum. δωρεὰν, φησ' δεῖ ἄνθ ἡμῶν κατορθωμάτων· καὶ πάλιν, ὡς μηδὲν ἕτερον συνεισενέγκαι πλὴν πίστεως.

——τὸ πιστεύειν μόνον συνεισφέρονλες.

* Aug de verbis Apost. Serm. 15. *prorsus gratis; qui nihil invenis, unde salves, multum invenis unde damnes.*

A third Testimony from Scripture the *Cardinal* pretends, is 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. *In which place*, (as *Chrysost. Ambrose, Theophylact*, expound it) *the Apostle teaches, that in Baptism men are purged and Sanctified; and that this is to be justified*; that all this is done in Baptism, is plain by the Apostles words, but that to be *sanctified* is to be *justified*, the Apostle saith not, nor yet those Fathers; But the *Cardinal* has this Gift often to give us Names, when their words will not serve his turn—— For *Chrysostom*, and *Ambrose* have

Bel. ubi suprà; *Quo loco, ut exponunt* Chrys. Ambr. Theoph. *Apostolus docet in baptismo purgari homines & Sanctificari: atque hoc ipsum est justificari.*

have nothing to his purpose; *Theophyl.* indeed has a succinct expression, *in justifying he Sanctified them*; if he had said in sanctifying he justifies, it had founded something to the *Cardinals* purpose; but in saying *justificans sanctificavit*, he speaks that (which we often insinuated above) the *concomitancy* of sanctification with, and the *dependence* of it upon Justification. Theoph in locum. δι. καιώσας ἡγίασε.

The *Cardinals* next Testimony, is from *Tit.* 3. 5, 7. where he would conclude *Regeneration* to be *Justification*. The place is answerable to that above, 1 *Cor.* 6.11. and may be accordingly answered, that there is *regeneration* and *justification* mentioned, and that they go together; but that Regeneration is Justification is still the false assertion of the *Cardinal*, inconsequently drawn from this, as from other places. He adds also *Rom.* 8. 29. & 1 *Cor.* 15.49. which do prove, especially the second place, our being made like to Christ in sanctification & inhærent righteousness: but whats this to Justification by that Image or likeness? It was far from the Apostles intent to say any thing in those places of Justification. Now whereas the *Cardinal* makes this Argument, *as Christ was righteous, so shall we, but he was not righteous by imputation,*

therefore not we— is fallacious, —It followes affirmatively not negatively: He was righteous by inhærent righteousnes, therefore we shall be so; this is true. But he was not righteous by an imputed righteousnes, therefore not we; this followes not: for we are to be made righteous not in the same manner every way, and reciprocally, but so as we are capable of, and stand in need of being made righteous. But thus much may serve for the *Cardinals* Testimonies from Scripture which we have found either to be impertinently applyed, or to speak against him: and therefore no marvel, that he could not alledge any Fathers so interpreting them, as he misapplies them to Justification by inhærent grace or righteousnes.

IX. Justification by inhærent Grace not proved by the Fathers.

Now let us take a brief View of the Testimonies of Fathers which he brings as Witnesses for him; of which we may say: as we found in his allegations out of Scripture, that they prove there is an inhærent Grace or righteousnes in us, not that we are *properly justified* by it; Amongst all the Fathers * he cites, there appears but one *Greek*, and among his *Latin* Fathers St. *Augustin* chiefly, a good witnes indeed, if taken as he means. To the many places alledged out of

* Bel. l. 2. de Justif. cap. 8.

of him, we may give this general answer; they either, only prove there is inhærent righteousness, or if they speak of *justification* by it, then is that word used according to the *Latine* Etymology: of making a man just or righteous by a real inhærent qualification: and that St. *Aust.* is so much inclined to interpret the word *Grace* used in Scripture, of the gift of grace inhærent in us: and sometimes to say a man is justified (*i. e.* made righteous inherently by it) came to pass, by reason he had so much to do against the Pelagians in asserting that *grace* given and inhærent in us: for they denied not the *grace* of God in the prime sense, as it speaks the *favour* and *love* of God to Mankinde: but made little or nothing of the other.

The chief and most considerable sentences cited by the *Cardinal* out of that Father are these. *As great a difference as there is between the light which doth illuminate, and the light which is illuminated; so great a difference is there, between that righteousness which does justifie* (which surely is the Divine righteousness) *and that which ariseth from Justification*; which is the inhærent; for else

Aug. Confess. l. 12. c. 15. *Quantum distat inter lumen quod illuminat, & quod illuminatur, tantùm distat inter justitiam justificantem, & justitiam, quæ ex justificatione facta est.*

else to take it as the *Cardinal* must for a comparison between the *inherent* and *actual* righteousness, there is not such a difference between them. So this place proves there is inherent grace or righteousness, as *light* communicated unto us, doth not prove a justification by it, but by the righteousness from whence that inherent righteousness proceeds: & therefore speaks against the *Cardinal.*

Another place alledged is this: *Which Nature, when it is justified of the maker, is translated from a deformed form to a beautiful form.* Here the *Cardinal* thought so much noyse of the word *Form*, would be enough to speak the inherent righteousnesse to be the *Form* of justification; whereas this only proves our renewing, transforming from the Image of the first *Adam*; that is, that there is a new righteousness also put in us, in our Justification, which we every where acknowledge, and is that which *Theoph.* said above, *Justificans Sanctificat*, when he *Justifies* he *Sanctifies.*

Aug. l. 15. de Trinit. c. 8. *Quæ natura, cum à suo conditore justificatur, à deformi forma, formosam transfertur in formam.*

Two other places he brings to prove the *inherent* to be our true righteousness: which we grant, in its *order* and *measure*, but not to the excluding of the *imputed*,

imputed; from its due order and place. The * *Cardinal* tels us, that St. *Aug.* in his Book of *Nature and Grace*, ch. 38. *teaches, that charity infused into our hearts is our true righteousness*: This is the *Cardinals* Collection; he does not give us the very words of that Father; we must therefore know that Book was written against the *Pelagians*; against whom it was his usual work to assert the true grace of God given us, and that all the good we have or do is from God, and that all the righteousness which is in us, though true, yet imperfect; and this is the very purpose of that place: He shews there, that *Abel* and many others in Scripture, *were just, yet were not without sin*,— and, *if in* Abel *the just, there was the Love of God, by which only every one is just, that is just* (that is, without which there is no true inhærent or actual righteousness) *yet was it such, as might and ought to be increased, and whatsoever was less* (then it ought) *was to be reckoned, as of vice*, or faulty. It is plain he did not mean the righteousness of Justification, or that those *just men* were justified by that righteousness he there speaks of; which will farther appear

* Bell. l. 2. c. 8.

Justi fuerunt, & sine peccato non fuerunt —qua una verè justus est, quicunque justus est: adhuc erat quo posset & deberet augeri, quicquid minus erat, ex vitio erat. Aug. de na. & gra. c. 38.

appear by the next place out of St. *Aug.* Book *Of the City of God*, the *Cardinal* draws this Testimony: *Here therefore is righteousness in every one, that God should rule over man obeying him, the minde over the body, and reason over vice.* *In this definition* (saith the * *Cardinal*) *the imputed righteousness of Christ hath no place, but only inhærent righteousness.* *Definition* of what? he could not say of *Justification*: for that Father speaks not of it in that place, and so the *Cardinal* is impertinent; But put the Case, that any were to give a Definition of Justification, should the *imputed righteousness of Christ* have no place in it? This is that they strive for, and think they allow it enough, if they grant that *by the merit of Christs satisfaction and righteousness*, we have grace & righteousness given us, by which we are justified, and have our sins purged out (which with them is *Remission*) and our persons *made acceptable*: we noted this * above: and this is that which keeps the Gap from closing, which might be reasonably made up, if they would give the Righteousness of Christ its due for our Justification, as we are ready to give inhærent grace and righteousness its due: both for the *Connexion* it hath with our

Aug. de Civ. Dei l. 19. c. 27. *Hic itaque in uno quoque Justitia est, si obedienti Deus homini, &c.*

* Bel. ubi supra.

* Nu. 4. ex *Vasque.*

of Justification, and for the *necessity* of it to our sanctification. But to return, there is enough in that chap. to shew how little it serveth to the *Cardinals* purpose. The whole place speaks of *Actual* righteousness, and that is not for his purpose: and the two first words (*Here therefore*) shews the dependence of this upon what went before, and thereby *the imperfection* of our righteousness *here* in this life; and that also is not to the *Cardinals* purpose. That which went before runs thus: *Our righteousness though it be true, as to the end of that true good, to which it refers and tends, yet is it such in this life, that it rather stands in the remission of sins, then in the perfection of vertues:* which shews *the imperfection*, as I said, *of any righteousness in us*, as needing continually in this life the mercy of God for pardon, and therefore unable to Justifie. As witness and proof of this St. *Aug.* adds, *the prayer of the whole City of God, sojourning upon earth witnesseth this, for she cries in all her members unto God, Lord forgive us our Debts:* and gives a reason, from this *mortal condition*,

Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 19. c. 27. *Nostra justitia quamvis vera sit propter veri boni finem, ad quem refertur, tanta tamen est in hac vita, ut potius peccatorum remissione constet, quam perfectione virtutum. Testis est oratio totius Civitatis Dei per omnia membra sua clamat ad Deum, Dimitte nobis——*

dition and *corruptible body*, * *which pr*
seth down the soul, so th
Reason does not perfectly r
over vice; therefore is su
prayer necessary for just pe
sons. The *Cardinal* replies to the first par
that mans righteousness consists in bo
that is, in the forgiveness of sins, and t
perfection of virtues, which is true of th
Righteousness St. *Aug.* speaks of, *viz.* th
actual righteousness of man in this life
for such is the righteousness of just or ju
stified men: of whom the Father speak
here— but they had another kinde o
righteousness by which they are first ju
stified. To the latter part he replies
That just persons pray so (as St. *Aug.* sai
they do) *and by this shew they need in*
dulgence of their venial sins. But if only
need remission of such (which may so
easily be satisfied for and done away)
St. *Aug.* had not said *potius in remissione*,
rather in the remission of sins: experi
ence also tels us that just men commit
greater sins, and need indulgence or re
mission of them too: and see how heed
lesly contrary the *Cardinal* is to himself
in so few lines; He had said, Mans righ
teousness stands in *both these*, Remission
of Sins, and Perfection of Virtue, and
meant

* — *quod aggravat animam, non perfecte ratio vitiis imperat; ideo— necessaria est justis talis oratio.*

Sic orare justos, ac per hoc indigere indulgentia venialium delictorum. Bel. ubi supra.

ant it of the righteousnes of *Justifica-*
n: in which he will grant the *Remis-*
n of all sins and of eternal death due to
em: Here presently he restrains Remis-
on to the indulgence of *Venial* sins.

I will but add two other places cited
ut of the same Father rendring the
ord *Justifie*; by *making just* or righ-
eous as when he saith: *Who has made*
ighteousnes in man, but he that justifieth
e ungodly? that is, *of an ungodly man,*
y his grace makes a just and righte-
us man: and to the like purpose he
peaks upon Ps. 96. By such expressions
St. Aug. truly speaks the *inhærent righte-*
usnes given us of God: and when he
alls this *Justifying* a sinner, he uses the
ord *Justifie* according to the *Latin*
rigination and importance of it: for
hereby a man is made truly *righteous* by
hat *grace* received: *righteous* I say, for
s measure and proportion: not to ex-
lude Justification by an imputed righ-
eousnes through faith, which is the pri-
ner and more proper meaning of the
ord *Justifie*. If therefore we finde
St. August. acknowledge another *Righ-*
ousnes and *Justification*, differing from
hat which he seems to ascribe to Inhæ-
ent Righteousnes: then have we our
ntent and purpose, and the *Cardinal* is
imper-

X.

The word *Justifie* sometimes improperly taken by the Fathers.

Aug. in Ps. Ps 118. conc. 26. —*qui justificat impium, i. e. per gratiam suam ex Impio facit Justum.*

impertinent, in his allegations out
St. *Aug.* as also in those other, which
pretends from other Fathers, which
may let passe, as speaking but the *bei*
of Inhærent righteousnes: not provi
justification by it, in any proper sense:
for example. St. *Ambrose* (who is one
those Fathers cited by the *Card.*) spea
of it according to the Grammatical or
gination of the word, *Justice* (saith he
from whence Justification is derived.

Ambr. in Hexam. l. 6. c. 8. *Justitia, unde justificatio derivata est.*

Now for St. *Aug.* his allowing of t
imputed righteousnes and our Justific
tion by it. See his *Ench*
rid. where he thus explai
that of the Apost. 2 *Cor.*
ult. He therefore was ma
sin, that we might be right
ousnes; and that not ours, b
of God, and not in our selv
but in him: even as he was Sin, not h
own but ours, and not in himself but in u
This admits none of their exceptions:
that we are made *righteous in him*, becau
we have our righteousnes by *his Meri*
and *the righteousnes of God because*
have it of his gift, and by the infusion
his Grace. This is all they can say, a
this though true of our inhærent right
ousnes, yet comes not home to the pu
pose of St *Augustine*, who saith plainly

Aug. Enchir. cap. 41. *Ipse ergo peccatum, ut nos justitia, nec nostra sed Dei simus; nec in nobis, sed in ipso; sicut ipse peccatum, non suum, sed nostrum, nec in se, sed in nobis constitutum.*

our Saviour was made Sin, not in him-
but in us— and manifestly acknow-
ges we are so also *made righteousness in*
, that is, righteousness is *imputed* to
See also how this is asserted by the
nt Fathers,

Chrys. on that of the Apostle 1 *Cor.*
30. *He doth not say he hath made us*
st, and just and holy, but he is made un-
to wisdom, and righteousness, and san-
ification: Which is as if he had said, He
hath given himself unto us. And upon that
2 *Cor.* 5. *ult. Made him sin for us*, the
me Father thus: *He suffered him to be*
condemned as a sinner. And here also he
bserves, as above: *The Apostle did not*
say we are made righteous, but righteous-
ness, and that of God, for it is the righte-
ousness of God, when it is not of Works,
but that we are justified by the Grace of
God: and he gives this as a reason of
he need we have of such a righteousness:
because there must be found no blot or stain,
so he observes, the Apostle said not, *made*
him a sinner, but sin; for he named not the
habit (as if sin had been inhærent in him)
but the bare quality, (as in the Abstract.)
which shewes that when he said righte-
ousness, rather then *righteous*, there is a
righteousness made ours beside the ἕξις
or inhærent quality. With *Chrysostom*
agree

Ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν ἔδωκε.

ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸν κατακεκριμένον Chrys. in locum.

ὅταν μὴ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἀπὸ χάριτος—

—κηλίδα ἀνεύθυνα πανὸς μὴ εὑρεθῆναι.

οὐ γὰρ ἕξιν ἔθηκεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὴν τὴν ποιότητα. Chrys. in locum.

agree *Oecumenius* and *Theophylact*, up the places cited.

Cyril. Glaphyr. 5. cap. ult.

So St. *Cyril* sets out our Saviour u der the name of *Iosedeck*, which signif *the righteousness of God, because we a justified in him through the mercy of Go* and unto this he applies that of *Iere* 23.6. *The Lord our Righteousness.* Oec

Oecum. in Phil 3. v. 9. ἡ γὰρ διὰ χάριτος & πίστεως Χριστοῦ δικαιοσύνη.

menius upon *Psal.* 3.9. *having my own righteousne but the righteousness which of God by faith:* gives us a d stinction of Righteousness *not properly, properly taken:* That is, our Righteousnes or the righteousness of Works. This is th Righteousness which is *by Grace, and th faith of Christ:* And needful it is, in thi Question and the Testimonies of Father concerned in it, to hold to the Justifica tion *properly taken.*

To this *imputed righteousness* belong that of the ancient Father *Justin Mar*

Justin ad Diogen. — καλύψαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας — δικαιωθῆναι ἐν μόνῳ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

tyr. What thing else ca cover our sins, but his righ teousness? and that which he adds, *to be justified i him only*, Which is a stronger expression then to be *justified by him*; and then he cries out, *O sweet and happy exchange!* wherein that? because, as the Apostle, *He made sin for us, we righteousness in him:*

…; or as *Justin* subjoyns, because *one …s righteousness justifies many unrigh…s men.*

To this also belongs what *Chrysost.* …th—who with reference to *Isa.* 43. 26. *…thou mayst be justified:* …us expresseth himself as …this point. *Freeing us …m punishment he gives …hteousness, for he makes a …ner to be alike* (or in the like condi…on) *to him that had not sinned*: which …ust needs be by not imputing sin and …mputing righteousness upon his faith …nd repentance.

Chrys. homil. 3. de pœnitentia. *Eximens pœnæ, donat justitiam, facit enim peccatorem, ἴσον εἶναι τῷ μὴ ἡμαρτηκότι.*

This *imputing of Righteousness* to him …hat believes will also appear by the Fa…hers using the expression of *sola fide*, by …aith only: There is scarce any Father …ut so expresses himself.

XI. Of *Sola Fides* in this point of Justification.

I promised at the beginning to speak …omething of *Faith only*, and of *Works*, …s to that which Antiquity yields unto …hem in the business of our Justifica…ion.

What this Faith is which justifies, was …fficiently debated * above, and also …why and in what respect *Faith alone* is …aid to justifie: The expression is ex…clusive; yet did not (as appeared above …in the fourth chapter) exclude the *præ…paratory*

* Chap. IV. nu. 3, 4, 9.

paratory workings of the soul, dispositi to Justification: did not exclude *Repe tance* and charity, but admitted them conditions to Remission: did not e clude *inherent Righteousness*, but on from being the formal cause of Justific tion properly taken: else it was admitt as a Concomitant and necessary quali cation of the subject or person justifie Lastly, it did not so exclude good wor as if justifying faith could be witho them: but did infer them as necessa consequents, engaging the soul to d them; and till so, it is not a believing t justification; and unless it continue doing, (that is still to engage the Soul t well doing or good works) the state Justification will not continue: I say, ti Faith does so engage the Soul, it is not believing *with the whole heart*, not a Ju stifying Faith. As St. *Chrysostom* (wh often attributes the whole to *Faith alone* requires it should be a *working Faith* as where he saith, *Faith ought not t be simply by it self, or alone*: and the shews how our willingness to suffer, (an in like manner our well doing) is from faith: *for our fellowship with him in suf ferings is from faith*, for he that believe he shall *reign* with Christ will be willing to *suffer*.

Chrys. in Phil. c. 3. v. 9. οὐχ ἁπλῶς δεῖ πίστιν εἶναι.

—ἀπὸ πίστεως ἡ κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων.

need not trouble the Reader here with particular sentences of the Fathers, that expression of *Sola Fides*, Faith The *Cardinal* has recited many, undertakes to answer them. Well, acknowledges the Testimonies, and his Answers they come to this, That *faith only*, is set against the works of *Mo- Law*. It is true, that it is sometimes but we must not think that the Apo- or Fathers denying Justification to be ght or had by the works of the Law, therefore admit our works under race to serve in the stead of the other our Justification; but do rather im- , that no men, *Jew* or *Christian* can be ified by doing, what they are bound do by the Law or Commandement, der which they are, as * above was ewen more amply.

Bell. de Justificat. l. 1. c. 25.

* Chap. IV. p. 102, 103.

Another of the *Cardinals* Answers is; hat *faith only*, excludes *the outward rk only* (as in the sentences there ci- d out of *Origen* and *Chrys.*) *but not Re- tance and Charity*. How it does not clude Repentance and Charity we said rd above; *i. e.* it admits them as Con- ions of Remission, but not to that ndition or Causality rather, which the hurch of *Rome* advances *Charity* to, in e work of our Justification: which is not

not a little to the prejudice of *the imputed Righteousness*, and of that singular act of Faith, for which its said, we are *Justified by faith only*: But when the *Cardinal* tels us, those Fathers said by *faith only*, because the *outward work* was wanting: not to exclude *Repentance* and *Charity*: he should have told us, whether he meant charity in *habit* only, or as sending forth its elicit Acts, and inwardly working— I suppose he will think it a great an absurdity to attribute Justification to a *bare, not working* Habit, as to a bare and not working faith: which they falsly reproach us with; and then he should have remembred, he made *Habitual* inherent Righteousness the *Formal Cause* of Justification, excluding the *Actual*, that is, charity as it is acting inwardly or outwardly; for this it must come to.

A third sort of Answer the *Cardinal* and generally they of the Church of *Rome* have, for Testimonies of Fathers which by *Faith only* exclude all righteousness in our selves (and cannot be shuffled off by saying, they exclude thereby all righteousness of Works before Grace, or done by power of our Free-wil without Grace) then to say, all *righteousness in us* is excluded and sometime denied, *as of our selves*, becaus

cause so we have none, but *of the gift of God.* This is in it self a great Truth, it makes no apposite answer, to *Faith* only, which we *have not of our selves* any more, then we have other Graces, and which is *the gift of God* as much as they. When *Chrysost.* saith upon that of the Apostle *Rom.* 5. 2. we have *by Faith access into this Grace*, (of Justification, reconciliation and peace with God) *We brought nothing with us, but faith only:* and when *Oecumenius* upon *Rom.* 3. 24. doth likewise, *bringing with us Faith only* to our Justification: it cannot be answered, we brought *nothing else of our selves*, for neither did we bring *Faith of our selves*, to our Justification; seeing therefore we do bring besides Faith some things else, as above granted: they may have their place either as *preparatives* and *dispositions*, to our Justification, or as requisite *conditions* to the Remission that is in our Justification; or as fitting *qualifications* of the subject or person justified; yet *Faith* we bring, as that which has a singular property and efficacy for the receiving this great benefit of Justification, for which it may be said *Fide Sola*, by Faith only. And this we are taught to say, both by Fathers and Scripture, that so we may attribute the

Chrys. in Ro. 5. Πίστιν εἰσηνέγκαμεν μόνον.

Oecumen. in Rom. 3. τὸ πίστιν μόνον σωτηρίαν.

more to Christs merit and righteousne
(which Faith apprehends) and the mo
lessen, or take off from, any righteou
ness in our selves. We may shut up th
discourse with that saying of *Theophyla*
wch the *Cardinal* cites as objected by t
Protestants: *Faith only has the power in i*
self of Justifying: & cannot be answered
the *Cardinal* would have it; *Faith o*
is said to have that power, because the
is nothing can justifie without Faith: s
so there are other things without whi
there can be no justification: but amo
all those things, or Graces, *Faith only* c
be said properly to Justifie.

Fides sola habet in se Iustificandi virtutem. ex Theophyl. in Ep. ad Gal. cap. 3.

XII. Not justification by Works in the prime sense.

And now for *Justification by works*, is in vain to put it to the trial of An quity: For as we may observe, the *Ca dinal*, though he concludes his 4. Book Justification with this Question, and pr tends several places of Scripture, to pro good works do Justifie: yet has he n thing from Antiquity for it. Indeed t Fathers did not know the *Romish* seco Justification, to which the *Roman* (when they are forced to speak distinctl do restrain their Justifying works; knowledging *all good works* follow Justi cation (in the first and proper sense) a that this second Justification, is but *crease in righteousness*, (as * above she

*Chap. IV. nu. 2.

d) We grant and so will the Fathers, that we are of duty to encrease in righteousness, and that our often actings, or doing good works, do augment the inhærent Righteousness: and that the more we do good works, the more *Favour* we have with God, the more *acceptable* are we to Him: but there are two words we have cause to reject; *Merit* & *Justificatio*. That good Works cause an encrease of the *habit*, and do obtain additional *grace*, we grant: but if they will stand upon the word *Merit* properly taken, we shall see in the next *Section*: Our good works cannot properly *merit*. Also we see no reason why this should be call'd *Justification*, to make a confusion in this Doctrine of so great concernment, *Mans Justification before God*, and to deceive people when they have the doctrine of *Justification by Works*, barely delivered unto them. If the *Romanists* would allow what they ought to the *Application of Christs merit and righteousness*, and give *Faith* its due, which apprehends that righteousness, and be content that *inhærent Righteousness* should hold its due place: there would be little cause of Controversie in this great point of Christian Doctrine. I will conclude with the *Cardinals* answer to a saying of holy *Bernard* upon the *Can-*

vide ch. IV. nu. 8. 105, 106, 107.

* Bern. in Cantic. *Christus nobis justitia,— & indulgentia Dei nostra justitia.*

ticles. * *Christ is our righte ousness because he justifies u from our sins:* and, th *Indulgence of God is ou righteousness.* By *Indulgence* and *Remiss on* (saith the * *Cardinal he understands full and com pleat Justification, becau (as we have often said) th sin is never remitted, b righteousness is together wi it infused.* And so say we: But the righ teousnes, which *Bernard* cals *Indulgence,* not the *Infused,* but the righteousnes *Justification*; for where sin is not im puted, there righteousness is imputed, a * above shewen out of *Rom.* 4. 6, 7. an this is indeed Divine *Indulgence.* Bu still we acknowledge, that continuance the state of Justification, is by goo Works, or continuance in wel-doing.

Bel. de Iustif. l. 2. c. 13. *Nomine Indulgentiæ & Remissionis, intelligit plenam Justificationem, quoniam ut sæpè d ximus nunquam remittitur culpa, quin simul—*

* Nu. 4.

SECT

SECT. V.

Of Merit of good works.

IT was obſerved above (Chap. V. nu. 1.) that the Council of *Trent* had defined, *Good works do truly merit eternal life*: but did not tell us plainly, wherein the Reaſon of Merit, *truly* ſo called, doth ſtand; only it gives us certain acknowledgements of Gods *bounty, promiſe,* and *grace*, which are ſo far from being the grounds of *Merit*, as Mr. *Spencer* there calls them, that they do by neceſſary conſequence overthrow it. The Queſtion therefore being about *Merit truly* ſo called, it will be firſt neceſſary to ſee into that; for the clearing of it will plainly ſhew the impertinency of what they alledge out of Scripture or Fathers for their works *truly* Meritorious.

I. Explication of the Queſtion and the Reaſon of Merit properly taken.

We ſpoke ſomething to this purpoſe (in the V. Chap.) as Mr. *Spencer* gave occaſion; We may further obſerve, that They who hold up the Controverſie (for the moderate ſort in the Church of *Rome*, do let it fall) uſe three Adverbials which ſpeak the meaning of that *Vere merentur*,

or *truly meritorious*: and they are *simpliciter, propriè, ex condigno*, simply, properly, and condignly meritorious; as we see in their * two great Champions for Merit.

* Bel. 5. de Iustif. c. 16. Vasq in 1. 2. Tho. disp. 213. c. 4.

The word, *Simply*, is alwaies exclusive of that which is so or so, according to *some respect* only; Now the *respect* here considerable and to be inquired into, has regard to Gods *promise*, *bounty*, and *acceptation*, whereby good works (say we) obtain so great a reward. The Asserters of Merit, will not say, that their *simply meritorious*, does exclude the *Promise*, or all *respect* unto it: but lay the Promise as a ground-work of their *merit*. The better to understand this mystery, we must consider, that the word (*to merit*) sounds two things, *obtaining*, and *deserving*: the first stands by the promise, but the second (which carries the reason of *merit*) stands by the worth of the work. The *Cardinal* and his fellowes must say, that if God had not made the *promise*, and of his *gracious bounty* appointed such a reward, the best service of man could not have *obtained* it, or brought him to eternal life: but they will also say, that such service would by the *worth* of the work and labour have *deserved* the reward. See

The word *Merit* sounds two things.

to

to this purpose, what the Cardinal putting the question of works *condignly meritorious*, delivereth: This way, saith he, be three manies varied or considered: that works be called *condignly meritorious, In regard of the Covenant or promise only*; or *in regard of the work only*, or *in regard of both*; In the first he supposeth the work or service *far inferiour to the reward promised*: as if a hundred Crowns should be promised for one daies labour in the Vineyard, In the second he supposeth *the work equal to the reward, but no covenant or promise intervening*; In the third he supposeth *the work truly equal to the reward*, set out in the Covenant or promise; and the example of this he makes the *penny* given to the Labourers in the vineyard, *Mat.* 20. And this third way he declares for, that Good Works are *condignly meritorious* in regard of both, the *promise* and the *work it self*: Whereas it is plain, that the *promise* makes but way for the Consecution, or *obtaining* of the reward, and is requisite to make works *meritorious* only according to the first and less proper importance of the word *meriting* for *obtaining*: but as for *deserving* of the reward, (wherein the

Bell. l. 5. de Justif. c 17. *Meritoria ex condigno, ratione Pacti tantùm, vel operis tantùm, vel ratione utriusque.*

—Opus multò inferius merc d: promissâ.

—Opus re. vera æquale mercedi,—

—Opus verè par mercedi.

reason of *Merit* properly stands) that laid upon the *worth* of the work, which supposed, as we see, to be *truly equal* t the Reward promised.

Vasquez, usually more free and ope then the *Cardinal*, plainly professeth an maintains, † *that good works without an promise, or divine acceptation are condign ly meritorious of eternal life, and have o themselves a value or worth equal to it* For he saw that the pretence of the Covenant or promise, or divine acceptation was no ground, but a prejudice to the reason of *Merit* truly so called: and therefore a little after sets himself to prove, that the *Covenant or promise does not at all belong to the reason of Merit*; and makes this his argument for the *condign meriting* of Good Works: *Sin*, saith he, *deserves a punishment equal to it, without all Covenant or Commination— therefore also the Works of the Just do condignly merit the eternal Crown of glory, without all Covenant or promise,* * *for this reward is equal to the worth of the work without the promise.*

But this is thwarted by the *Bull* of *Pius* V. and *Greg.* XIII. two Popes condemning certain Propositions, of which this is one. *Even as the evil of sin in its own nature deserves eternal death, so a good*

† Vasquez in Tho. 1. 2. disp. 214. c. 5.

Vasq. c. 8. —*nullo modo pertinere ad rationem meriti.*

Vasq. ibid. cap. 10. —*absq; ullo pacto vel commination e.*

**—*siquidem hoc præmiũ æquale est*—

Vasq. ibid. cap. 13.

work of its own nature deserves or merits eternal life. What else did *Vasquez* say? but he strives to clear himself by pretending this difference between his Assertion and the condemned Proposition: that the Author of those Propositions held good works *without Grace* were so meritorious, which *Vasquez* does not: Now whether Jesuites little regard what their Popes define in their Bulls, being never destitute of an Evasion: or whether indeed it be the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and the meaning of the Councils *Vere merentur*, (that good works done in grace do as *truly deserve*; and are as *condignly meritorious* of eternal life, as sins and evil deeds are of eternal death) I will not further inquire into: but out of that which has been said, we may draw up the Question to this Issue.

II. The Issue of the Question.

That the first way set down by the *Cardinal* and rejected by him (*Good Works are condignly meritorious in regard of the Covenant and Promise only*) was indeed, rightly interpreted, the true and ancient Doctrine of the Church, asserted by the Fathers, and the former Writers of the Church of *Rome*, as may in part be seen by those Authors whom the *Cardinal* and *Vasquez* have noted, and rejected. We need not here be afraid of

the words *condignly meritorious*: for being joyned with those words, *(in regard of the Covenant and promise only,)* they must have such a sense as their consistence will allow: which is, by interpreting the word *meritorious* according to the first importance of consecution or *obtaining*, and the word *condignly* according to such a *deserving* or worthiness as stands by *divine acceptation*, when we do the condition which the promise requires, in such a sort as God will accept unto a reward; Even as in Scripture holy Men are said to be *just* and *perfect* through divine acceptation. So it comes to this plain Truth: *The good Works and Life of holy Men will be accepted of God as good and faithful service, and certainly obtain eternal life.* See *Mat.* 25. 21. *Well done, thou good* &c.

In this sense the *Augustan* and *Wittenburg* Confessions did not abhor to use the word *meritorious*; nor *Brentius* and *Melanchthon*, as *Vasquez* notes of them; and in this sense we need not be affraid to admit it, and to say, that *good works do merit*, that is, do *obtain*, or are rewarded with eternal life, through the gracious acceptation, bounty, and promise of God; and one would think this were enough for us, both to encourage us to do good,

and

to comfort and ſtay us in the doing of it, and perſevering in it, without ſtanding upon any farther title, or conteſting with God that we have made him our Debter, or that eternal life is due to our works, for the *worth* of them. This is therefore that which we deny, *That good works do truly, and properly merit eternal life: Truly* and *properly*, I ſay, as *deſerving* it upon the *worth* of the work; and good reaſon have we to deny it: Finding all they can bring from Scripture or Fathers, as I hinted above, impertinent and inconſequent to the proving of *Merit truly* ſo called; yea, it will appear that the more ancient writers of the Church of *Rome* are againſt it, yea, they that aſſerted it, are forced ſometimes by Truth it ſelf to yield ſo much, as may overthrow it.

III. Scripture alledged for the Name Merit.

First, out of Scripture, they give us two places bearing the *Name* of Merit; but it is only according to their *Latin* tranſlation, not according to the Original *Greek*: The one place is *Eccleſ.* 16. 15. *according to the merit of their works*, ſo their Edition; but the Original, is *according to their works*, as we finde it often ſaid in the Scriptures. But *Bellarm.* and *Veſquez* reply: what is it to *render according to their works, but to render to them as*

Κατὰ τὰ ἔργα.

—reddere ſicut opera merentur.

as their works deserve or merit? to which we may say: Albeit such expression, (*as their works deserve*) may be very well admitted, yet is there much difference between *Secundum opera*, according to works, and *as their works deserve or merit*, taking the word Merit in the Cardinal sense; for to say *according to their works*, is but to speak the *quality* of them, that it shall be well with those that do well, and on the contrary, evil to those that do evil: it does not speak *equality* between the *work* and the *reward*. St. *Gregory* speaks home to this purpose upon the 143. *Psalm*. *If it shall be rendred to every one*, saith he, *according to their works, how shall it be accounted mercy? but it is one thing to render according to works, another to render it for the works themselves: for in that, where it's said, according to their works, the very quality of the works is meant: that they whose works appear good, shall have a glorious retribution.*

Greg. in 7. Psalmum pœnitential. v. 8. *Si secundùm opera, quomodò misericordia æstimabitur? Sed aliud est secundum opera reddere, aliud propter ipsa opera reddere. In eo enim— ipsa operum qualitas intelligitur—*

Another place they alledge for *Merit*, is *Heb* 13.16. which in their *Latine* Edition has *promeretur Deus*, as bad *Latine* as *Divinity*. In the Original εὐαρεστεῖται, *is well pleased*, and so by *Oecumenius*, the word

word is interpreted by καλῶς ἀρέσκεσθαι, which signifies as much as *well pleased.* Indeed the Ancient *Latine* Fathers did some of them, especially St. *Cyprian*, (according to the ancient and innocent meaning of the word *Merit*) use to say *promereri Deum, i. e.* to engage, or *oblige* of God what he had promised; but we do not contend about *Words* or Phrases. Let us see what they bring for the proof of the *thing it self*, Merit *truly* so called.

IV. Their Scriptures to prove the thing. From Reward.

First they alledge all those Scriptures that call eternal life a *Reward*, and compare it to the *hire* or *pay* of Labourers: We grant it is so often call'd: but the inference, therefore our works or labour does *truly merit* such reward, is inconsequent; for the Apostle supposes there is a *reward reckoned of Grace*, as there is *of Debt Rom.* 4. 4. Accordingly St *Aug.* (*Merces nostra vocatur Gratia—*) *Our Reward is called Grace, and if so, then is it freely given.* And St. *Ambrose* tels us in his Epistles there is *Merces liberalitatis*, the Reward or Recompence of liberality: where *bounty* is seen on the one part rather then *desert* on the other. Between man and man, there may be Merit, and Reward according to *debt*, or justly due: not so between God and man; yet is

Κατὰ χάριν, καὶ τὸ ὀφείλημα. Aug. in præfat. Ps. 31.

is Gods rewarding ſet out by the other to ſhew the certainty of the recompence, and that it ſhall be rendered according to their works; not that the ſimilitude ſtands good in all parts: for the *duty* of man to God is antecedent to all covenant or promiſe, the *ability* man has to perform it is from Gods free grace, the *reward* given is infinitely beyond all that man can do.

Of Reward given in proportion to Works.

Secondly, They alledge all ſuch Scriptures, as ſpeak the reward given *according to works*, therefore *proportionably* to the works; and what is that elſe but according to *Merit*, when as in giving there is regard had to the worth or dignity of the work? This Argument alſo is inconſequent: for admit that the reward is given *according to works*, and in the giving it, there is regard had to the *dignity* of them, yet does not this conclude them *meritorious*: as we ſaw above, Nu. 3. Good works indeed may be different in worth and dignity: yet all infinitely below the eternal reward: And in the reward there is the *ſubſtance*, and *degrees* conſiderable: the *eſſential beatitude* or eternal life, and the *degrees of glory*: All that are ſaved, have eternal life, not all the ſame glory; The Penny was given to all

Mat. 20.10. To this purpose St. *Ambr.* *Thou hirest in Labourers at the ele-* *venth hour, and dost vouchsafe them* *an equal reward: an equal reward of life,* *not of glory:* The difference of reward upon the difference of good works is in the *degrees* of glory: and if some *proportion* be observed in this, yet nothing of *Merit*: where God does but crown the greater gifts he bestowed here, with the greater glory there. If they will plead *proportion*, our Saviour tels them, *an hundfold is received*: and thats no fit *proportion*, to ground *Merit* on; If they plead reward given *according to dignity* of the works: St. *Paul* tels them, *The sufferings of this life, are not worthy to be compared with the glory*— excluding all proportion of *worth* between the *sufferings* and the *glory*.

Ambr. l. 7. in Luc. 15. v. 17. —*aequalem mercedem Vitæ, non gloriæ.*

Mat. 19.29.

Rom. 8.18. οὐκ ἄξια πρὸς τὴν δόξαν.

Thirdly, Such places of Scripture, as speak works to be the cause or reason of giving eternal life— as Mat. 25. 35. *For— ye have fed— cloathed— Which places* (saith the *Cardinal*) *do witness eternal life so given, that they put the very Reason, wherefore it is given, upon the works.* Those places do give a *reason* indeed, why such and such obtain eternal life— but not the *very Reason*, or the

Bel. l. 5. de Justif. cap. 3. —*ut ipsam rationem cur detur vita æterna, in operibus ponent.*

the chief Reaſon; for there is a greate Reaſon; a Reaſon, wherefore ſuch work are rewarded with eternal life; and tha deſtroyes the *Merit* of ſuch works though not the *certainty* of their obtai ning; and that is Gods gracious bount and liberality appointing ſuch a reward to ſuch ſmall performances; and there fore is it ſaid in the 34. verſe, an Inhe ritance and *Kingdom prepared* for them and then dependently on that it is ſaid *Inherit the Kingdom, for ye have done* tha which I required of you, in order to in heriting the Kingdom; ye are ſuch as they, for whom the Kingdom is prepa red.

Reward in Juſtice, how?

Fourthly, Such places of Scripture as ſpeak Gods *Juſtice* in giving the reward, 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 6. 2 *Tim.* 4, 8. But this is ſtill inconſequent as to the inferring of *Works meritorious:* unleſs they can ſay, God renders the reward to good works, according to *Commutative* juſtice, which gives one for one by equal proportion; but ſuch Juſtice is not found between God and Man; for man returns nothing to God, which he can call his own, nothing but what he has received of God. As for the *diſtributive* or remunerative juſtice, it is true that God may be ſaid in ſome ſenſe to render the reward in juſtice;

ice; yet not for the *merit* of the rks, but out of the *bounty* of his libera- , and the faithfulneſs of his promiſe: od was not bound in juſtice to prepare, ppoint, or promiſe ſuch a reward to ſuch rks, but having appointed & promiſed it is *juſt* with him to render according- . So the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the Juſti- ing of a ſinner (which the *Romaniſts* emſelves ſay cannot be merited) uſeth ſame word: *that he might be juſt, i. e.* keeping his promiſe to all that *believe Jeſus.* So when the Fathers in their gh language ſpeak of Man making God *Debtor*, they mean it only in regard his own promiſe, whereby he has freely ound himſelf. St. *Auguſt.* ay anſwer for them all, *The Lord*, ſaith he, *made himſelf debtor, not by receiving any thing, but by promiſing.*

Aug. in Pſa. 83. *Debitorem Dominus ipſe ſe fecit, non accipiendo, ſed promittendo.*

Laſtly, Such places of Scripture, as peak us *worthy*— So *Luc.* 10. 7. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 5. *Rev.* 3. 4. This argument as the reſt inconſequent — They are *worthy*, there- re their *Works are meritorious*, or there- re they have the reward for the *worth* their works: whereas this worthineſs iſes by *divine acceptation*, by which ey are *accounted worthy*. *Bernard* may anſwer

Worthy of the Reward, how?

Bern. de dedic. Eccl. ſer. 5. *—illius dignatione non noſtra dignitate.*

anſwer them once for all, *We are* [illegible] *thy*, ſaith he, *by his dignation not by* [illegible] *own dignity:* See alſo above Chap. [illegible] nu. 8, 9.

IV. Their Teſtimonies out of Antiquity examined.

In the Teſtimonies alledged by the out of the Fathers, they give us but word or bare ſayings; But we produce the F thers witneſſing for us againſt *Merit*, a giving reaſon withall to overthrow The Greek Fathers have not any wo that fully anſwers the importance of t Latine word *Merit*; but the *Roman* uſually tranſlate κατορθώματα (which o curs frequently in theſe Fathers, eſpeci ly *Chryſoſtome*, and ſignifies no mo then *recte facta*, Deeds rightly done good works) *Merita*, Merits. Such *rits*, that is, good works, we acknowled the Fathers do allow: and the *Car nal* acknowledges that *Aug.* (in whoſe Books t word *Merit* is moſt fr quently found) uſes it, *every good work, in reg of which we receive ſome other thing.* W then: we acknowledge holy men full ſuch *Merits* or *good Deeds*, and that th ſhall *obtain*, or be *rewarded with*, et nal life. And I dare ſay there is not a Father that affirms more: as we may

Bel. de gra. & lib. arbitr. l. 1. c. 14. *Meritum appellat quemlibet actum bonum, ratione cujus aliquid aliud accipimus.*

hat Collection, which the *Cardinal* made. Bel. l. 5. de Justif. c. 4.

e begins with the Greek Fathers: produces their sayings only in Latine there he has (as I noted above) this usually to choose the worst transla-; so when he makes *Ignatius* say, *ssim promereri Deum*, whereas the eek word ἐπιτυγχάνειν signifies *to ob-* or *enjoy God*; although we need not fraid of the phrase (*promereri Deum*) ich we shall see St. *Cyprian* often using, an innocent sense, according to the ning of those ancient Times. So the rdinal makes *Justin* Martyr to say, *uros cum eo suis meritis*, that they ll *live with him* (God) *by their me-*: whereas the Greek is, to be *accoun-* worthy of his conversation, or of being th him; In like manner, that St. *Basil* ould say, speaking of the Forty Mar-s; *They have merited (promeriti sunt)* wns of glory; and *what oration or* ech *can sufficiently set forth or reach* ir *Merits?* where the same word is d, *they were accounted worthy*, or did ain such Crowns; and that which he nders *their Merits*, is in the Greek ir worthiness or vertue.

He cites *Chrysostom*, saying in his hom. n *Lazarus*: rendred, *according to their Merits*; Justin. Apolog. 2. τῆς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἀναστροφῆς καταξιωθῆναι. Basil. in orat. de 40. Martyr. τῶν στεφάνων καταξιωθέντων. τὴν τούτων ἀξίαν.

κατ' ἀξίαν. *Merits:* the Greek ſounds *according* *their deſert*, and ſpeaks of both wick and good, and is no more then what t Scripture often ſaith, *according to th works*, and what *Tertullian* cals *the diſ* *mination or ſevering of both merits*, of t one to *puniſhment*, and of the other *reward*; as we ſee ſet forth in *M* 25. 32. and in the different end of t rich glutton and of *Lazarus*, *Luc.* 16. 2 they were dealt with according to th different lives: and thus *Clemens* in Strom. doth more then once uſe t κατ' ἀξίαν, which is according to th works, or deſert: It ſpeaks the *differe* *of deſert*, in the one and the other, do not ſpeak the *Worth* or proportion of t work to the reward of eternal life: T this purpoſe it was ſpoken * above upo their alledging *Ecclus.* 16. *according* *their Merits*, for *according to the* *Works*.

Diſpunctio utriuſque meriti. Tertul. in Apolog. c. 18.

* Nu. 3.

That which he alledges out of *Irenæ* and ſome other Fathers, ſpeaks only t this purpoſe, that eternal life is acquire and obtained by good works: whic was the ſecond thing we acknowledge to be aſſerted by the Ancients, an by us admitted, as a Truth which make nothing to *condign Merit*, truly ſo cal led.

The

The *Latine* Fathers cited by the *Car-*
l, albeit they have the word *Merit* Bel. l. 5.
e frequently, yet do they indeed de Justific.
k no more then the former. St. *Cy-* c. 4.
n we grant does often use the phrase
romereri Deum) but according to —*prome-*
innocent meaning (as I said above) *reri Deum.*
those Times, for *obtaining* or *procu-*
Gods Favour by doing that which
pleasing to him: or for *enjoying* God
his presence in bliss and glory.

That which the *Cardinal* cites out of
eg. Mor. 4. c. 42. out of *Celestines*
ist. and out of *Bernard* in *Cantic.*
ntributes no more to the *Romish* cause
en the word *Merit*, put for *good Deeds*,
ly *Greg.* implies there, that the glory
ill be proportionably the greater, and
swerable to the measure of *good Deeds*,
hich we deny not; but we deny that this
dvancement of the reward and increase
f the glory, which does so much more
et out the divine bounty and free libe-
rality, should be made an argument for
ndignity of mans merit, as the *Romanists*
o, and the *Cardinal* did, (above nu. 3.)
rging those Scriptures for *Merit*, which
peak *the Reward given in proportion to*
the works. But that which the *Cardinal*
brings out of *Celestine*, (who was also Bi-
shop of *Rome*, and is here cited for the
Names-

Names-ſake of *Merit*) ſpeaks ind
againſt them: *So great* (ſaith he) *i*
goodneſs of God towards
men, that he is pleaſed, t
ſhould be our Merits, wh
are his Gifts, and that
Will give us the eternal
wards, for thoſe things wh
he had beſtowed freely upon us before, whi
deſtroyes the very reaſon of their *Me*
properly taken.

Tanta erga omnes homines eſt bonitas Dei, ut noſtra velit eſſe Merita, quæ ſunt ipſius dona, & pro his quæ largitus eſt, æterna præmia ſit donaturus. Celeſt. in Ep.

That which is cited out of *Ambro*
de Offic. l. 1. *c.* 15. ſaith no more, th
according to their works, whether they
good or bad: as above in the Teſtimo
drawn out of *Chryſoſtome*. The ſayin
of *Hierome* and *Hilary*, ſpeak but the
cond thing we acknowledged, *viz*, th
good deeds will obtain or be ſo rewarde
Indeed St. *Aug.* cited by the *Cardin*
here may ſeem to ſpeak more then t
former. *As unto the m*
rit of ſin, death is rendr
as the ſtipend and wages,
is life eternal rendred (
a ſtipend) to the merit
righteouſneſs. Where t
ſtipend or wages is no more then *R*
ward. This is clear by what he ſait
in relation to the Apoſtles ſaying *Rom*
6. *ult. A ſtipend is rendred as due fo*
th

Aug. ep. 105. ad Sixtum. *Sicut merito peccati, tanquam ſtipendium redditur mors: ità merito juſtitiæ tanquam ſtipendium, vita æterna.*

labour of the warfare, is freely given: there- the *Apoſtle ſaid*, The ges of ſin is death, (and erefore eternal life can- be thus called a *ſtipend*) grace (or the gift of od) *except it be free, is not grace*; d St. *Aug.* adds immediately as con- quent to it: *Therefore we uſt underſtand, that the Merits* (or good Deeds) *Man, are the gifts of God: which when eternal life given, what is there elſe ven, but grace for grace?* And by this may ſee, how St. *Aug.* meant, what ſpeaks elſwhere upon that of *Rom.* 6. a ſaying that the *Romaniſts* ſtill op- ſe to the argument we make againſt *Merit* from the Text of the Apoſtle: St. *Aug.* ſaying is this: *The Apoſtle might have ſaid, and ſaid it truly, that the wages or ſtipend of Righteouſneſs is life eternal; he choſe rather to ſay, the Gift of God*— He might have ſaid it in a true ſenſe, (taking the word *ſtipend* as above, for a *reward* or recompence) not in an equal or anſwerable ſenſe to the other (the *wages* or ſtipend

Aug. Enchirid. c. 107. *Stipendium pro opere militiæ debitum redditur, non donatur: Ideo dixit ſtipendium peccati mors; gratia verò niſi gratis ſit, gratia non eſt.*

Intelligendum eſt igitur, ipſa hominis bona merita eſſe Dei munera: quibus cùm vita æterna redditur, quid niſi gratia pro gratia reddi- tur? Aug. ibid.

Aug. de Gra. & lib. arb. c. 9. *Cum poſſet dicere & rectè dicere, ſtipendium juſtitiæ vita æterna, maluit dicere*—

ſtipend, *of ſin is death)* for then it would not have conſiſted with the Truth of that which the Apoſtle did ſay, *but the gift of God is life eternal*; nor with the end and purpoſe, wherefore the Apoſtle did chooſe to ſay, *the gift*, rather then *the ſtipend*, *viz.* to exclude all thought of merit of condignity: as it follows there in St. *Aug.* *He choſe rather to ſay*, The gift of God is life eternal: *that we might underſtand, how God brings us to eternal life, not for our Merits, but for his Mercy ſake.* There is ſcarce any of the Ancients, that has either commented on that Text of the Apoſtle or occaſionally ſaid upon it, but obſerves the apparent diſtinction which the Apoſtle purpoſely makes, in ſaying Death is the *wage* or *ſtipend* of Sin—but not ſaying ſo of life eternal.

Maluit dicere, Gratia Dei vita æterna, *ut intelligeremus, non pro meritis noſtris, Deum nos ad vitam æternam, ſed pro ſua miſeratione perducere.*

There is another place cited out of St. *Auguſt.* that makes a great noiſe of Juſtice in giving the reward: *God is not unjuſt* (ſaith he) *that he ſhould defraud* or diſappoint, *the juſt of the reward of their juſtice*, or righteouſneſs. But upon what reſpect God is ſaid to be *juſt in rewarding:* was ſhewen * above

Aug. de nat. & gra. c. 2. *Non eſt injuſtus Deus ut Juſtos fraudet mercede juſtitiæ.*

* Nu. 3.

anſwer to thoſe places of Scripture, ch ſpake Gods *Juſtice* in that parti-. And the ſame anſwer may ſerve hoſe Teſtimonies which the *Cardinal* others bring out of the Fathers, ſaying ome loftineſs of Language that man good deeds may make God *his Debtor*: Wiſeman in effect ſaid ſo, *Prov.* 17. and that proverbial way of ch may bear it. That ſaying of St. *Aug.* ich in this Controverſie of Merit, ch has forced the *Cardinal* thrice to tion) will clearly unfold how God omes, and may be call'd, Mans *Debtor*, anſwer all plea of *Merit*, made from ſpeeches of the Fathers. *The Lord*, h he, *makes himſelf a tor*, and how is that? *by receiving from us, but miſing unto us.* To this poſe it is what the ſame Father ſaith ſwhere, * *O thou, that payeſt Debts, nders what is due, yet oweſt nothing y man, (qui reddis debita, nulli debes)* re *(debita)* debts, are *(promiſſa)* his miſes. And † elſewhere: *do not ſay to God, ren- becauſe thou haſt re- d, but render becauſe thou haſt pro- id.*

Aug. Pſ. 83. *Debitorem Dominus ipſe ſe fecit, non accipiendo, ſed promittendo.*

* Aug. l. 1. Confeſſ. c. 4.

† Aug. Serm. 16. de verb. Apoſt.—*redde, quia accepiſti; ſed redde, quia promiſiſti.*

The *Cardinal* pretends he can eas
answer all this, and replies thus: It
said so by St. *Aug.* becau
*God owes nothing to any m
absolutely, but only by
promise, and his own bou
and gift*; This is fair a
true: but nothing to
advantage, and therefo
not many lines after,
sups it up again with t
same breath, saying; *Nevertheless, th
God is made our Debter not only by his p
mise, but by our work too: St.* Aug. te
cheth, *when he subjoyns*; we may say re
der what thou hast promised, for we ha
done, what thou commandest. If t
may be said to God Almighty, yet w
such caution, that it cannot (as bold as
is) be a plea for *Merit*: for it must
said with respect to the *bounty and p
mise* of God appointing such a reward
them, that do so and so; and with a
knowledgment of his *Free-grace* helpi
us to do so; wherefore it follows imm
diately in St. *Aug.* (which the *Cardi*
thought good to omit) *and this thou h
done, which hast helped those that labo
or strive to do well.* If we take it not
said in such a respect, St. *Aug.* himse
will judge it a proud and presumpt
o

Bel. l. 5. de Justif. c. 18. sect. Sed facilis —*absolutè, sed solum ex promissione & dono suo; quod autem non ex sola promissione sed etiam ex opere nostro Deus efficiatur Debitor, docet Aug. cum subjungit, —redde, quod promisisti, quia fecimus, quod jussisti.*

Et hoc tu fecisti, qui laborantes juvisti. Aug. Ser. 16. de verbis Apost.

saying; for so it is censured by him, Psal. 142. vers. 2. *Enter not into judgment*— where he brings in the presumptuous justifiers of themselves, saying; *We have fasted and thou seest not— we have done, what thou hast commanded, why dost thou not render what thou hast promised? To such* (saith he) *God will answer, that thou maist receive what I promised, I gave unto thee to do. Finally the Prophet speaks to such proud ones*, &c. If therefore man may so plead, *render what thou hast promised, for we have done what thou hast commanded*, it must be with such corrections; *We have done what thou commandest*, what thou graciously doest require of us, and accept as condition of obtaining what thou hast bountifully promised: *We have done*, but what was our duty antecedently to thy gracious promise; *done* what thou mightest have required of us without such reward: *done* what thou didst help and enable us to do: and *done it* but imperfectly, so that it needs thy merciful acceptation: and still need to say, *Enter not into judgment with thy servants, O Lord.*

Against the plea of Merit.

* Aug. in Ps. 142. *Jejunavimus, & non vidisti; fecimus quod jussisti, quare non reddis quod promisisti— —ut accipias quod promisi, ego dedi ut faceres—*

Now to proceed to the Testimonies of Fathers, against *Romish Merit*. First we

V. Testimonies of Fathers against *Romish Merit*.

alledge their sayings, whereby they plainly deny *Merit*, or that we are *Worthy*. And here we must observe (as to the sense of those words, *Merit*, and *Worthy*, in this Controversie) a great difference between those sayings of the Fathers, which barely affirm our *Merits* or *Worthiness*, & those wch deny the same: I say a great difference between the force of the one and of the other; For when they affirm, they speak according to the remiss sense of *Merits*, put for good works obtaining eternal life: and do mean such a *worthiness* that consists by divine acceptation; but when they deny either, they speak punctually to the exclusion of that *worth* and *merit* which the Church of *Rome* would establish in the Works themselves, as answerable to the reward; Thus *Bernard*, *We are so by divine dignation, not by our own Worth or dignity*: & a little after he saith, *Divine dignation hath no place, where there has been a presumption or conceit of self-dignity*. Thus when they are upon the negative they speak punctually & distinctly of *merit* and *worth*, as concerned in this Controversie. St. *Basil* speaks home, * *Eternal rest*, saith he, *remains for them that have striven lawfully in this life, not rendred according to Debt, unto the work-*

Those that deny Merit and Worthiness in us.

Bern. de dedicat. eccl. ser. 5. *... dignatione divinâ, non dignitate nostra — Nec dignatio locum habet, ubi fuerit præsumptio dignitatis.*

* Basil in Ps. 114. — οὐχὶ ὀφείλημα ἔργων ἀποδεδομένη, ἀλλὰ χάριν τῆ —

rks: but given according to the grace a bountiful God. He ſpeaks it with re-rence to thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *ceforth a Crown is laid up for me,* *Tim.* 4. and a diſtinction borrowed m the ſame Apoſtle, *Rom.* 4. 4. *of ce,* or *of debt:* and ſo cuts out all the re of pretended Merit, which the *Ro-niſts* would fix in the former place of *Tim.* 4. The *Cardinal* cites this Teſti-ony of St. *Baſil,* as objected by Prote-nts, and ſhuffles pitifully in his replies lt: Firſt leaving out the word (κατὰ *ειν, according to grace,* he repeats the rd ὀφείλημα, Debt in the ſecond place: l makes St. *Baſil* ſpeak thus, *rendred according to the Debt of their works,* *according to the debt of a bountiful d,* meaning, it is not rendred accor-ng to *abſolute debt* or right: but accor-ng to *the debt of Bounty.* This excepti-nof *abſolute right or debt* is one of their neral anſwers; But the *Cardinal* has is gift as to chooſe the worſt tranſlati-n, ſo to follow the worſt copy, for the *ris* edition has κατὰ χάριν, and the ne-ſſary conſequence of the words would fer it, beſide the reference it had plain-to *Rom.* 4. 4. from whence it was bor-owed: And the *Cardinal* might have be-thought himſelf, what good ſenſe he

Bel. l. 5. de Juſtif. c. 6.

could make of his repeating the word *debt* in the reddition, saying, *the debt of bountiful God*— which surely cannot reasonably be said by the Assertors of *Merit*. But to shew, he could yet speak more against sense aud reason, he adds a second reply: that St. *Basil* excludes only *Merits which man may have from himself and his own strength*. This is their other usual exception to the Testimonies of Fathers denying *Merit*, that is say they, only such *merits* as are pretended to *before Grace*, such as are *of our selves* and *own strength*; but how impertinently is this replied here to St. *Basil*, who most plainly speaks of their *reward* and *works* that have *fought a good fight?* St. *Aug.* we hear often denying *Merit*. *When the reward*, saith he, *shall come, He will crown his own gifts, not thy Merits*. And above we had him speaking to *Rom. 6. ult. we are brought to eternal life, not for our merits, but through his mercy*: and elsewhere, *Thou shalt receive eternal life, not through thy Merits, but the Grace of God!* The two former places of *Aug.* the *Cardinal* sets down, and replies according to their usual exception: that he speaks *against Merits before or without Grace*. It is most true, that St. *Aug.* in his Controversie with the *Pelagians*

Merita quæ sunt homini à se, & suis viribus. Bel. ibid.

Aug. in Ps. 70. con. 2. *Coronabit dona sua, non merita tua.*

Aug. Tract. 3. in Jo. *Non pro merito quidem accipies vitam æternam, sed pro gratia.*

gians does very often ſpeak againſt
h Merits, and that all thoſe ſayings of
e Father are miſapplied in this Contro-
ſie of *Merit of good Works*: but it
s true, that he often cals good works
erits, (Merits after grace) and of thoſe
denies Merit in a proper ſenſe, when
denies, not only the *firſt grace* to be
en for our Merits; but *eternal life* alſo,
d ſaith, that when the Lord gives it,
crowns not our merits but his own
ts: *i.e.* our good works, not upon the
count of *Merit*, but of his free gift and
unty. That place which the *Cardinal*
ings out of St. *Aug.* to countenance
s impertinent reply, affords enough to
nfute it. *What haſt thou* (ſaith that Father there) *which thou haſt not received?* (this indeed excludes all Merit before the firſt *receiving of grace*, but he goes on to the *receiving of life eternal*) *wherefore, O Man, if thou ſhalt receive eternal life, it is the ſtipend indeed or reward of rigteouſneſs*, (becauſe righteouſneſs or holineſs of life is appointed as the condition of obtaining it) *but to thee it is grace* (or the gift of God) *to whom alſo righteouſneſs* (or power of weldoing) *is grace*, and of the gift of God.

Aug. Ep. 105. ad Sixtum. *Quid habes quod non acceſiſti? quapropter, O homo, ſi acceperus es vitam æternam, juſtitiæ quidem ſtipendium eſt, ſed tibi gratiæ eſt, cui gratiaeſt ipſa juſtitia.*

Nunc ergò de plenitudine ejus accepimus non ſolum gratiam, quâ juſtè in laboribus uſque ad finem vivimus; ſed & gratiam pro hac gratia, ut in requie poſtea ſine fine vivamus. ibid.

And a little after he adds, *Now therefore we receive of his fulneſs not only grace by which we live juſtly in our labours and endeavours to the end, but alſo grace for that grace, that we may for ever hereafter live in reſt.* Here is excluded plainly, not only Merit before grace, but afterward, and not only the firſt grace is here called grace; but eternal life alſo is called grace, and *Merit* every where excluded, becauſe the righteouſneſs, which carries the reward, is not of our ſelves but of grace, and Gods free gift: as alſo the reward is of his free bounty and promiſe. In like manner,

Aug. Ep. 105. Cum Deus coronat merita noſtra, nihil aliud coronat quàm munera ſua.

when he ſaith, *God crowns his own gifts, not our Merits,* or as he ſaith in the ſame Epiſtle, *God, when he crowns our Merits* (our good Deeds) *crowns nothing elſe but his own gifts:* in ſaying ſo, he plainly excludes *Merit* after grace, *Merit* I ſay properly taken.

To the like places out of *Proſper* (*de vocat Gent. c.* 17.) out of *Greg.* (on the ſeventh penit. Pſalm, above cited) and out of *Bernard*, (*de annunc. Serm.* 1.) all denying *Merit*: the *Cardinal* has nothing to oppoſe but his uſual impertinency, of *Merits before*, or *Without Grace*; whereas

reas they all ſpeak of giving (not the
grace, but) the reward of eternal life.

Our ſecond rank or ſort of Teſtimo- VI.
s, is of ſuch as affirm: That the beſt Teſtimo-
mercy and forgiveneſs, and that nies affir-
righteouſneſs ſtands chiefly in Gods ming our
ciſulneſs and indulgence; and there- continual
our need of *mercy* excludes the plea need of
merit. St. *Aug.* upon Pſ. 142. *Enter* mercy and
into judgment — and an- indulgence.
me in thy Righteouſ-
— ſaith thus: *In thy*
teouſneſs, not in mine:
when I look back upon
ſelf, I finde nothing mine but ſin. He
t begs ſo cannot plead Merit. We had
caſion in the former Sect. to alledge
hat St. *Aug.* in his 19. Book, *de Civit.*
i, ſpeaks of the *imperfection* of our own
ghteouſneſs in this life: the ſame is for-
ble to exclude our *plea of*
Merit. Such, ſaith he there,
our righteouſneſs in this
fe, that it ſtands in the re-
miſſion of ſins rather, then in the perfection
of vertues. And in the ſame chapt. he
hewes, ſuch neceſſity incumbent on us
in this mortal and bodily condition, that
one thing, wherein mans righteouſneſs
ſtands, *is to beg of God pardon of his of-*
fences and failings; and this, he ſaith,

Aug. in Pſal 142. *In tua juſtitia non in mea, ad me enim cum reſpicio nihil aliud meum quam peccatum invenio.*

Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. 19. c. 27. *ut potius peccatorum remiſſione conſtet, quam perfectione virtutum.*

— *ut à Deo petatur venia delictorum.*

the *Lords Prayer witneſſeth*, which te
cheth us daily to beg, *forgive*. To th
purpoſe that of * St. *Ambr.* in his exhor
to Virginity. *VVhence have I ſo great m
rit, to whom Indulgence
in ſtead of a Crown?* and u
on Pſ. 118. in reference
thoſe words, *thy tender me
cies*, and *thy judgments*,
the 156. *verſ. The Lor*
(ſaith he) *tempers his jud
ment with mercy: for whi
of us can ſubſiſt without t
divine mercy & indulgence*
And a little after conclude
the proceſs of divine Judg
ment is made, * *not according to our Me
rits but Gods Mercy.*

St. *Hilary* upon the beginning of th
31. *Pſ.* (or as with us, the 32.) wher
the Pſalmiſt places righteouſneſs in th
forgiveneſs or *not imputin*
of ſin: ſaith thus, *The work
of righteouſneſs will not b
ſufficient for a deſert or Me
rit* (or obtaining) *of tha
bliſſe, unleſs that the mercy of God— do no
impute our faults.*

Greg. the great, ſaith thus in his Com
ments on *Job*, *If I grow up to the work o
vertue, I come to life, not by my merits, bu
by*

* Ambr. in Exhort. propè finem. *Unde mihi tantum meriti, cui indulgentia pro Corona eſt?*

Ambr. in Pſ. 118. concione 20. —*quis enim noſtrum ſine divina poteſt miſeratione ſubſiſtere?*

* *Non ergo ſecundum merita noſtra, ſed miſericordiam Dei—*

Hil. in Pſ. 31. *Opera juſtitiæ non ſufficient ad beatitud. niſi miſericordia Dei— —non reputet vitia.*

Greg. mor. 9. c. 14. *—ad vitam non ex meritis, ſed ex venia—*

his pardon and indulgence: To these sayings of *Hilary* and *Gregory*, the *Cardinal* answers, *by their needing of the remission of Venial sins:* as if the several acknowledgments of these and other Fathers, yea of the * *Psalmist* too, did but plainly, they complained only of some *venial sins*; and stood in need only of *mercy* for them. Experience may sufficiently convince such conceit of vanity and presumption. Holy *Bernard* in one sermon gives many reasons against the presumption of *Merits*, and alledges the example of the *Psalmist*, *Who* (saith he) *is greater then the Prophet?* (that is, could better plead merit and righteousness) *yet he held it necessary to say*, Enter not into judgment with thy servant. * Ps. 143. 2.

Bern. de Annunc. ser. 1.

VII. Testimonies affirming our Duty to the excluding of Merit.

Our third rank or sort of Testimonies, is of such as speak our *Duty* in doing all we can: conformably to that of our Saviour Luc. 17. 10. *Say, unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.* The *Romanists* think to elude this Scripture, by saying: Though we be *unprofitable* to God, yet we may be *profitable* to our selves, gaining everlasting life by our good works—— This is true, but its one thing to gain or obtain so great profit, as eternal life by good works, another thing to *merit* it by doing them:

and

and if our being *unprofitable to God* wi
not overthrow the *Romish* Merit, yet ou
duty to do all we can will do it. Indee
unto *Merit* taken in the most strict sen
according to *absolute right* and debt, it
required that a man bring profit and ad
vantage to the person, of whom he cha
lenges any thing by such Merit: but be
cause the *Romanists* will say there is no
such *Merit* between God and Man
therefore the force of the Argument rest
upon the *Duty*— which silences all ple
of such *Merit* they contend for: Meri
truly so called.

St. *Aug.* thus, *O the great goodness o*
God! to whom though w
ought by reason of our Crea-
tion to return all service and
obedience, as servants to our
Lord, as bond-servants to
our Redeemer: he makes us promises of re-
wards as to friends.

Aug. Serm. 3. de verb. Domini —*Cui cum pro conditione reddere debeamus obsequia —ut mancipia redemptori—*

Bernard in his Sermon of the *fourfold*
Debt, shews (as the * *Cardinal* acknow-
ledges) that all our good works are so
due to God, that he might exact them,
although he would give no
reward; *He is thy Creator*
(saith *Bernard*) *thou his*
Creature: thou art a ser-
vant, He thy Lord: He the
Potter

* Bel. de Justific. l. 5. c. 14. sect. Tertia.

Bern. de quadrup. debito. *Creator tuus est, tu Creatura, tu servus, ille Dominus, ille Figulus tu figmentum, Totum ergò quod es, illi debes—*

Potter, thou his workmanship: therefore all that thou art, thou oweſt to him, of whom thou haſt all.

Theophyl. ſaith, *A ſervant that doth not his work, is worthy of ſtripes, but when he has done his work, let him be content that he has eſcaped ſtripes:* that is, if reward come for ſo doing, let him account and receive it as of meer bounty; for it follows in *Theophyl. Therefore that ſervant ought not to exſpect honour or reward as neceſſarily following,* or as due (as he might, if he *truly* merited) *for it is of his Lords liberality and bounty, to give him, yea rather frankly to beſtow any thing upon him;* where we may obſerve he did not think it enough to ſay (δῶναι) *give him,* but adds χαρίσασθαι, *freely beſtow* on him; the better to expreſs the undeſerved bounty of God, ſo rewarding man for doing what was his *duty* to do.

Theophyl. in Luc. 17. 9. ἀρκεῖδω ὅτι τὰς πληγὰς ἐξέφυγε— —ἐπὶ τούτῳ μισθὸν ζητῶν ἀναγκαίως— —τῷ δοῦναι αὐτῷ μᾶλλον ὑπὲρ χαρίσασθαι αὐτῷ.

Bernard gives a good reaſon againſt our *Meriting, becauſe all our Merits are Gods gifts* (that St. *Aug.* ſaid often) but he adds, *and for them man is a debtor to God.* So far are Gods gifts of Grace from being the ground of *Merit* (as the *Romaniſts* pretend) that they take from it by encreaſing our *Duty* and Debt.

Bern. de Annun. ſer. 3.

Our

VIII. Testimonies affirming the Improportion of our works to the reward.

Our last sort or Rank of Testimonies is of such as speak, our sufferings or doings not to be compared with the Reward in any proportionable measure, and herein they have the Apostle going before them. *Rom.* 8. 18. 2 *Cor.* 4. 17.

St. *Ambrose* thus; *What can we do worthy of those Cœlestial rewards?* which has so much the more force in it, if we consider what goes before, and what follows after it. He had said before; *God tempers his judgment with mercy, and none of us can subsist without the divine indulgence:* then immediately after alledging that of the Apostle *Rom.* 8. 18. he concludes, *Therefore the execution of the heavenly decrees proceeds not according to our Merits but the mercy of God.* Something of this, we had above in the second rank of Arguments, Nu. 6.

Ambr. in Ps. 118. conc. 20. *Quid possumus præmiis dignum facere cœlestibus?*

Greg. the first, upon the *seventh penit. Psalm*, having said, *God renders according to works, not for our works* (which saying was made use of above) he adds immediately as a reason; *For unto that blessed life, in which we live with God, and of God, no labour can be equal, no endeavour or doings compared with it, especially seeing*

Greg. in Psal. 142. *Illi namque beatæ vitæ, in qua cum Deo & de Deo vivitur, nullus labor æquari potest, nulla opera comparari, præsertim cum Apostolus——*

ing the *Apostle* saith, *The sufferings of this life are not worthy— Rom.* 8.18. *Anselm* saith, *If a man should serve God most fervently for the space of a thousand years, he could not merit condignly to have half a day in the kingdome of heaven*; so great a disproportion did he conceive there was between our performances and the heavenly reward.

Amselm. de mensur. Crucis prope medium — *Non mererentur ex condigno, dimidiam diem esse in regno cœlorum.*

Lastly, *Bernard*, on the *Canticles*: *It may suffice for Merit to know, that our Merits are not sufficient*: for such a reward and bliss: besides many other sayings he hath in those Sermons to beat down Merit; as also in his Sermons on the *Annunciation* (the place above cited *Nu.* 6.) where among other Reasons that may be gathered, this from the improportion of our good works to so great a glory is one.

Bern. in Cant. Serm. 68. *Sufficit ad meritum scire quod non sufficiant Merita.*

The whole School agrees in this, that to *merit* is an act of *justice*; and *justice* alwaies requires an *equality* between the things, which are awarded one for the other; as between the price, and the thing bought; between the offence and the punishment, between the work and the reward; And though the Assertors of *merit*,

merit as it ſtands between God and man cannot finde the Reaſon of Juſtice either *commutative* or *diſtributive* properly between them: yet *Durand* holds them to it, if they will have good works *condignly meritorious* of eternal life in proper ſpeech and ſenſe, they muſt finde ſuch an equality and proportion between Mans ſervice and Gods reward, as Juſtice in a proper ſenſe requires. To make up ſome proportion between them, it was *Aquinas* his invention, (and is held to by all the Aſſertors of Merit, for they have no better defence then to ſay) *Good works are proportionable to eternal life, in as much as they proceed, or are done by the Holy Ghoſt.*

Dur. l. 2. diſt. 27. qu. 2. nu. 6

Quatenùs à ſpiritu Sancto fiunt.

Dur. quo ſuprà nu. 8, 9.

But this could not blinde *Durands* eyes, who anſwers it with good reaſon. The force of that invention he thus puts by way of objection or Doubt: *The grace of Gods Spirit which we have, is equal to glory though not in act, yet in vertue: becauſe it is a kinde of Seminary of glory; Now the Seed of a Tree, is in vertue the whole Tree*; Which was the reaſoning of Mr. *Spencer* above in Chap. V. nu. 4. *Durand* anſwers firſt to that of *their proceeding from the Spirit of God*: *An Agent*

Etſi non actu, eſt tamen aqualis in virtute— Seminarium quoddam gloriæ; Semen autem in virtute eſt tota Arbor.

gent, saith he, *doth not perfect the pa-* *Agens non*
ent according to it self or its own perfe- *perficit pas-*
on, but according to that which is put *sum secun-*
in or impressed, and formally exists in the *dum seipsum*
ect or the power of the subject: that is, *sed secun-*
though the Holy Ghost be of infinite *dum aliquid*
perfection, yet the grace or gift infused *immissum.*
impressed is finite and imperfect in it
self: Indeed the Master of the School who
did not distinguish the gift of Charity
from the Holy Ghost it self, (could he
have made it good) might have stood
upon the extraordinary perfection of that
gift; But all that followed him quitted
that erroneous opinion: and the Asser-
tors of Merit, not able to defend that
opinion, can as little defend the answera-
ble proportion, they say good works have
to eternal life, because they proceed from
the *Holy Ghost*: *Durand* adds another
reason to confute them; *because the Ho-*
ly Ghost * *moveth to acts which are not me-* * *Movet ad*
ritorious, as the prophesying of Balaam, and *actus, qui*
Saul; So the many gifts which St. *Paul* *non sunt me-*
speaks of 1 *Cor.* 12. were all from the *ritorii.* ibid.
Holy Ghost; though such as the *School*
calls *Graces given gratis*, or not to *Gratia gra-*
the purpose of justification or Merit: *tis data.*
yet all proceeding from the same Spi-

IX. Concessions

I will conclude with the Concession of those that assert Merit *truly* so called. The Council * of *Trent* thus: *Eternal life is to be propounded to them that do well, both as Grace mercifully promised through Jesus Christ to children, and as a reward faithfully to be rendred through the promise of God to their good Works and Merits.* If they would hold here, there would be no further Controversie; and if they will give cause still for exception by adding for all this, that good works do *truly merit*, yet is that decree of the Council enough to refute it. Moreover in the same Chapter the Council affirms: *Christ infuses virtue continually into Persons justified, as the Head into the Members: Which virtue alwaies precedes, and accompanies and followes their good works and without which they could not be acceptable to God.* This is good: but inconsistent with that which follows: *and meritorious— and that such do truly merit eternal life*— for therefore those works (though *acceptable* to God) cannot be also *meritorious* because they are so from his free grace.

Sess. 6. c. 16. —*tanquam Gratia filiis misericorditèr promissa, & tanquam Merces ex ipsius Dei promissione fideliter reddenda*—

—*tanquam Caput in membra, jugitèr virtutem influit*— *Semper antecedit & comitatur & subsequitur*— —*Grata & meritoria*— *& Verè promeruisse*—

The *Cardinal*, that stoutly takes upon him

Bel. l. 5. de Just. c. 16, 17, 18.

to maintain (againſt ſo many honeſt
oolmen and Writers, (that went be-
him) That good works are *Con-*
uly and truly meritorious, not only by
ſon of the *promiſe* of God, but by rea-
of their own *worth*: and that God is
Debter to us not only by his *pro-*
e but by our *work:* He I ſay, had be-
granted enough to overthrow ſuch
Aſſertions. For he proves a man Bel. l. 5. de
be received into the ſtate of *Adopti-* Juſtif. c. 12.
before he can Merit, and that is an
of *free Grace*, alſo that life eternal is
to ſuch children as *an Inheritance:*
ich Title overthrows the other preten-
Title of Merit; For albeit Almighty
od has freely prepared the heavenly
eritance, yet he will have us do ſome-
ing for it; upon the doing whereof we
y expect and ſhall *obtain* what he has
freely prepared and faithfully promi-
: without challenging it by the Title
Merit.

Furthermore, He tels us, the Doctor Bel. c. 14.
whom *Pius* V. condemned, and of
hom we ſpoke at the beginning of this --*meritoria*
ct.) held *that good works were of them-* *ex ſua na-*
lves meritorious, ſo that a Convention or *tura*—
e promiſe was not requiſite for this, that --*gratuita*
e reward of eternal life ſhould be in ju- *promiſſio ad*
ice due to good works. Now albeit what *hoc, ut ex*
this *juſtitia de-*
beatur--

this Doctor asserted, was most false, does it plainly follow upon the *Rom* Doctrine of *truly meritorious:* which t Doctor saw plainly must be deserted, this must be maintained: he saw plain that if good works were *truly meritorio* they would be so whether there we *promise* made or no (for as I noted abov The *promise* makes not for the *merit* of t work, but for the consecution or o taining of the reward) also he saw, that eternal life were by *a gracious and fr promise*, it could not be *due* to the wo of *Justice*.

Lastly, the Cardinal in the same pla acknowledges, *We are a by our Creation servants, ye bond-servants of God: an that there cannot be justic between us & God: unless h had been pleased of himself by a free Con vention to appoint a reward to our works which were otherwise due.* *Due* antece dently to all promise, *due* from our being and Creation: and if all the *justice* tha can be found 'twixt God Almighty and us men, be in regard of his promise only, as indeed it is, it cannot be in regard o any obligation the work it self casts upon God, to make him our Debtor, as the *Cardinal* above did not fear to assert.

Bel. l. 5. de Just. c. 14. sect. Tertia-- *Omnes conditione servi & Mancipia Dei-- --operibus nostris alioqui debitis--*

Truth,

truth, and the Conviction of Gods
and bountiful dealing with man, ex-
such Conceſſions from them, as do
ciently contradict their bold Aſſerti-
, and might put end to the Controver-
if ſome unjuſtifiable ends did not
engage them.

SECT. VI.

Of Purgatory.

I. What Purgatory is?

THat Purgatory is conceived to be a Place of pain or puniſhment, & that Souls of juſt Perſons, departed out of his life, is plain by the * Council of *Trent:* and by the Reaſon or ground of according to the *Romiſh* conceit; beauſe it is for thoſe, to whom the ſin and he eternal puniſhment is forgiven, but he temporal not fully ſatisfied by them ere, and therefore muſt be payed or born ereafter. This appeared above, chap. VI. m. 1. 5. 6.

* Seſſ 6. Can. 30.

The *Cardinal* is bold to affirm, that Purgatory is an Article of the Catholick faith, and may be proved all the four waies,

Bel. li. 1. de Purgat. c. 15.

waies, that points of Faith use to be pr
ved by, *viz.* by expres Testimony
Scripture, with the Declaration of t
Church; So is the *Consubstantiality*
the Son with the Father proved; or
evident deduction from that which is e
pres in Scripture; So is the Article
two Wills in Christ proved, &c. and so
Purgatory proved, saith the *Cardinal*
and he boasts that he has so proved i
by giving us many places of Scriptur
mistaken, as to that sense, and many say
ings of Fathers misapplied, as to tha
purpose; which will appear upon th
Trial following.

It will appear, that this Doctrine o
Purgatory is not Catholick, but the in
vention of later Times: taking *Rise* fro
that which St. *Aug.* hinted, as probable
touching pains after death: and then ha
ving an *Advancement* by fabulous report
of Visions and deluding apparitions i
St. *Gregories* time and after; at last re
ceiving a *Definition* and establishment i
the Church of *Rome*. And for the coun
tenancing of it, They force many places o
Scripture, and whatever they finde in the
Fathers, concerning *prayer for the Dead*,
or touching a *purging Fire*; though spo
ken to other purpose: doing therein as
those Hereticks of whom St. *Hilary* said

that

r they drew Scripture *to that, which* —*ad id quod*
y had of themselves presumed, or before *præsumpse-*
ceived to be proposed and held as runt credendum.
tter of Belief.

For better proceeding: We will re-
ce all to these Heads. The *Place* or
te of Souls after death: The *Prayers*
t were made for the Dead: The *Re-*
ission of sins after death. The *pains* or
nishment after death. What the *Ro-*
nists bring from Scripture or Fathers
eching any of these, we shall meet
ith. As for the Texts of Scripture al-
dged by them, we may say this in Gene-
l: They have no consent of Fathers
r such a sense as they would fasten upon
e Texts they cite in behalf of Purga-
ry.

First for the *Place* or *state* of souls de- II.
rted; There are two Scriptures especi- Of the
ly which they alledge for such a *place* Place or
f Souls, as they phansie Purgatory to be. state of
The one is *Zach.* 9. 11. *I have sent forth* departed.
y prisoners out of the Pit, where no water Scriptures
: which text in the first and immedi- alledged by
te sense speaks the deliverance of that the *Roma-*
cople out of the *Babylonish* captivity: *nists.*
ut is by many of the Ancients applied to
ur Saviours bringing forth the Souls
f the Fathers of the old Testament out
f their Receptacle or *Limbus*. And
the

Bel. l. 1. de Purgat. c. 3. *Non est aqua Consolationis.*

the *Cardinal* acknowledges, it has been usually taken in that sense, but thinks it as proper for *Purgatory*, and the rather because in this there is *not the Water of consolation*, as there was in the other. And this is to be noted here, because we shall finde the *Cardinal* below put to devise how prayers for the Dead, made by the Ancient Church for those *that rest in peace*, could concern Souls in purgatory, that is in Torment, and cannot invent any expedient for it, but by referring that *rest* and *peace* to the *Comfort* and satisfaction they have there *together with their Torment, by reason of their hope*, and assurance of coming out of those pains into eternal bliss. That which the *Cardinal*, for proof of his interpreting that text of *Zach.* in behalf of *Purgatory*, fastens upon St. *August.* is not that Fathers expression or intention, but the *Cardinals* misapplication. St. *August.* in the places cited by the *Cardinal* Epist. 49. ad *Euod.* & lib. 12. in *Genes.* c. 33. speaks of our Saviours descending into Hell, and delivering some that were there; but *i.e.* in *Purgatorio*, is the *Cardinals* addition.

Bel. l. 2. de Purgat. c. 4. *—admixtam cum cruciatibus incredibilem consolationem, propter certam spem salutis.*

The other Text is *Mat.* 5. 25. where we read of a *prison* and a *payment* to be made there, but what proof is there more then a strong phansie, that this must signifie

ſhe Purgatory? The *Cardinal* indeed
dges ſome Fathers, uſing thoſe words
ur Saviour as a Commination againſt
ners, but that they ſhould thereby in-
d a *Romiſh Purgatory* is ſtill the *Car-*
ls miſapplication. One and the chief
thoſe Fathers cited by him, is St. *Cy-*
an in his *Epiſt.* 52. *ad Antonian.* where
plainly, as we ſhall ſee below, applies
t of the *priſon*, and the *paying of the ut-*
farthing, to the Severity of Eccleſi-
ti Pennances and Satisfactions, under
ich the *Lapſi*, or thoſe that fell in time
perſecution, were held. Now when
Fathers give any direct interpretation
that place, they either reſtrain it to
literal, as it inforces concord and
tement between man and man: or
e it in the *parabolical* ſenſe as applia-
to our agreement and reconciliation
God, for want or neglect of which the
ſion of Hell and eternal ſufferings there
ll follow. St. *Chryſoſtom* and ſome
hers are content with the firſt way,
t. *Aug.* and others apply it in the Pa-
bolical ſenſe: not to any place or pains
Purgatory, but to Hell and the pains
ver ceaſing. To this their own Au-
hors conſent. *Muldonat* on the place
pounds it of Hell and eternal puniſh-
nt; ſo *Janſenius*, and others. *Salme-*
ron

* Aug. 1. qu. ad Dulcitium; and elſewhere.

Janſ. concord. c. 40.

ron seems indifferent, first setting dow
that Interpretation of the eternal punish
ment, and acknowledging *Aquinas* an
others so to take it; but thinking it ap
pliable also to *Purgatory*, cites the ver
same Fathers, which we said above, wer
cited by the *Cardinal* and misapplied a
to this belief of Purgatory.

III. The opinion of the Fathers inconsistent with Purgatory.

Now see we what the Fathers hold ou
concerning the Place or state of Souls, be
tween the Day of Death, and of the Re
surrection; We shall finde it inconsisten
with *Romish Purgatory*; as may appea
by the Particulars following.

I. They held but two states, places o
Receptacles of Souls, the one of *pain an
grief*, the other of *rest and bliss*; Ther
is scarce any Father, but concludes th
from the Parable or story of *Dives* an
Lazarus, *Luc.* 16. the one going t
Hell, the other to *Abrahams bosom*.
need not cite the places, which are obv
ous to every one that looks into the
Writings.

II. They did not agree about the pa
ticular place of the Souls of Just persons
which difference among the Ancient
shews plainly that this place of Purgator
was not then known. St. *Irenæus* an
many that followed him, held they wer
all kept in a secret Receptacle below t
ou

Iren. l. 5. c. 31.

of Heaven and ſight of God till the ſurrection; which place was alſo called them *Hades*, or an *Inviſible place*; and metimes *Abrahams boſom*: This condi- on of Souls, *Irenaeus* cals *Legem mortuo-* *Legem mortuorum ſervavit*— the Law of the Dead: and ſaith, as r Saviour obſerved it, not aſcending to s Father till after his Reſurrection, ſo uſt all his Diſciples: and gives this Rea- n for it, *Becauſe the diſciple is not greater then his Maſter*. Of this common Re- pracle of Souls till the Reſurrection eaks *Lactantius* in his 7. Book, and hap. 21. Alſo *Tertullian* in ſeveral pla- s: only he ſeems to allow Martyrs this erogative to enter Heaven upon their ath, as in his Book *de Anima* c. 55. d in his Book of the *Reſurrection*, c. 43. his was one opinion of the Ancients, and eld by many; But others conceived the ouls of Juſt perſons were admitted into eavenly bliſs and a ſight of God: whom *renaeus* notes in the firſt words of the hap. above cited: *Some* (ſaith he) *of* *Quidam ex his qui rectè putantur credidiſſe, tranſgredientur ordinem promotionis Juſtorum.* *thoſe, that are thought to believe aright, do tranſgreſs the order or degrees of the pro- motion of the Juſt, viz.* by admitting them (as he conceived) too haſtily into Hea- n: Of this Judgment was *Cyprian* and nerally the Fathers after him: as we hall ſee preſently. Now as the former Tert. l. de Anima c. 7. & cap. 55. & contra Marc. l. 4. c. 34.

opinion that kept Souls out of Heaven till the Reſurrection could not ſtand with the doctrine of *Invocation* (as we noted above in the II. Sect.) ſo this diverſity of judgment touching the place of Souls after death could not conſiſt with a belief of *Purgatory*.

III. Although the Ancients were not agreed upon the particular place, or degree of bliſs: yet all held the place and condition, in wch they put the Souls of Juſt perſons, to be a place of reſt and refreſhment and a bleſſed condition. This is manifeſt becauſe they ſet it out by the place of *Lazarus*: alſo becauſe the Prayers which the Church anciently made for the Dead, were ſtill *pro quieſcentibus*, for them that were at Reſt, as we ſhall ſee below. And St. *Aug.* (whom I ſpecially name becauſe he firſt ſtumbled on a conceit tending to Purgatory) doth often ſpeak of the ſecret Receptacle of good Souls at reſt: ſometimes with diſtinction from that place where they ſhall be after the reſurrection (as in his *Confeſſions*, l. 9. c. 3, and of the *City of God*, l. 12. c. 9.) ſometimes in oppoſition to that other receptacle or place of pain and grief, as in his Enchirid. c. 107. and in his ſecond queſt. to *Dulcitius*. But we ſhall have occaſion below to ſhew that St. *Aug.* was not

…e at any certainty, as to this point of *Purgatory*.

Lastly, Those ancients which held the Souls of Just persons admitted into Heavenly bliss, did suppose (and so expressed it) that they went thither *presently* after Death, without any diversion to, or detention in any place of pain and torment. III. Souls of the Just go presently to bliss.

The Author of the Questions in *Justin Martyr* thus: *After their going out of the body, there is presently made a difference between the Souls of the just and the wicked: for they are both carried to places worthy of them*: What are those places? *The Souls of the Just* (saith he) *into Paradise; but the wicked into the Regions of Hell.* Quæst. ad Orthod. 75. Εὐθὺς ἡ διαστολή. Ἀγονται δὲ εἰς ἀξίους αὐτῶν τόπους.

S. Cyprian in his Book of *Mortality*, giving comfort against the sickness that swept away many Christians, as well as other, useth these Reasons: *Because good Christians by death are put into possession of Paradise: they do return into their own Country after their peregrination in this life: they then go to Christ, begin to reign with Christ: It is for him to fear death, that is not willing to go to Christ, and that believes not, he shall then begin to reign with Christ. And when the servants of God are drawn out of the storms of this world, they gain the haven of and eternal* Cypr. l. de mortalitate. —*Possessio Paradisi*— *in Patriam regredi* —*ad Christum ire*— *& cum Christo incipere regnare.* —*de turbinibus mundi exiracti*—

--tranquillam quietem-- Justi vocantur ad refrigerium, injusti ad supplicium.

mansion and security, and have an undisturbed rest; and *at death, the just are called to a refreshment, the unjust to punishment*. All this to comfort Christians against death by their *present* removal to a blessed condition: And none of these can be said of them that go to Purgatory; for that is not to take *possession* of, or enter into Paradise: that is not the *Countrey* which the faithful seek: not a *reigning* with Christ: not the *Mansion of Rest* or *Port* of eternal security, and *undisturbed quietness*. And these several expressions of this Father may assure us, that the place so much urged by the *Romanist* for a semblance of Purgatory, must have another meaning, then that they would put upon it. The place is this: *It is one thing to stand* (as a Penitent) *for pardon, another thing to come to glory: One thing to be cast into prison, and not come thence till the utmost farthing be payed, another thing presently to receive the reward of their faith and vertue: One thing to be cleansed by suffering a long grief for sins, and to be purged a great while by fire, another thing to have all a mans sins purged away by the passion of Martyrdom. One thing with suspence to expect the sentence of the Lord in the day of judgment, another thing to be presently crowned of the*

Cypr. Ep. 52. ad Antonian.

Aliud est ad veniam stare--

--pro peccatis longo dolore cruciatum emundari, & purgari diu igne--

--pendere in die judicii ad sententiam Domini.

the Lord. The objectors of this place, were they not so ready to phansie a Purgatory meant, where ever they finde mention made of a *Prison*, or *last Farthing*, or *Fire*, might easily see those phrases and expressions to be used with reference to the severity of Ecclesiastical satisfactions and pennance, to which they that fell (the *Lapsi*) either by Adultery, or renouncing through fear the Christian faith, were put to: The occasion upon which he spoke it, was an objection made against the receiving of those, that fell in time of persecution: *that if such favour were shewen them, and Ecclesiastical discipline let loose, we should have no Confessors or Martyrs.* He answers, * *We give peace to Adulterers after their time of pennance fulfilled: and yet Virginity fails not in the Church, but flourisheth:* then follows that place as affording reason for their receiving of penitents, from the severity they are put to, and the great difference between their Condition, and the happiness of those that have continued constant or proved Confessors and martyrs; And therefore he expresses that severity, with which the *Lapsi* were handled, in a reference to the Martyrs sufferings and priviledge: That they *stood long desiring pardon*, before they could be

* *Nam & Mœchis à nobis pœnitentiæ tempus conceditur, & pax datur, Non tamen, idcirco virginitas in Ecclesia deficit.*

restored to former state: that they were as Men *held in prison*, till they made full satisfaction; that they were put to a great *Torment*, in the shame and grief of their pennance, and the anxious sollicitude of obtaining what they desired. And lastly, as to the *Sentence* and *Judgment of the Lord*, there is a great difference between them and the Confessors, or other Just persons, who without suspence and such solicitude expect the sentence of the Lord: for that, *Pendere ad sententiam Domini*, is spoken either of the Time, while they are under Ecclesiastical Censures, during which time they continue in great perplexity and suspence, as to *the sentence of the Lord*, till they be reconciled to the Church: which often was deferred to the time of their Death: or else it is spoken in relation to a more severe scrutiny and examination, which they shall undergoe at their appearing before the Lord; and not have that ready admittance, which Confessors and other Just persons that needed not their repentance shall finde, being admitted *without delay readily*, as St. *Cyprian* speaks of them, or *without judgment to grace and favour*, as *Ambr.* on the first Psal. vers. 5. whereas the other shall be held under *a scrutiny, examination, an opening of their*

Sine cunctatione—

Sine judicio ad gratiam.

their failing and denials: what ſhame then and confuſion of face (ſaith St. *Ambroſe* there) *when all ſhall be laid open*, or *when then in that, which thou taughteſt others thou did not do?* Thus ſometimes ſome Fathers ſpeak of thoſe, that dye in a ſalvable condition, through faith and repentance though late: as diſtinguiſhable from thoſe that died Martyrs, or having repented betimes, had lived long in a conſtant courſe of Chriſtian profeſſion, and careful performance of righteouſneſs. St. *Ambroſe* thus: * *When that day comes* (the day of death) *they go to their Redeemer, to the boſome of* Abraham: yet * elſewhere he ſeems to defer it to the Reſurrection, according to the firſt opinion of the Ancients delivered above: Unleſs we take that *going to Abrahams boſome* generally, for a ſtate of bleſſed Reſt: and be that where it will, either below or in Heaven, yet their going thither preſently upon death, excludes *Purgatory*.

Dionyſius in his Eccleſ. Hierarchy ſpeaking of thoſe that dye in the Lord, tranſmits them preſently *to a Chriſt-like Reſt*. *Nazianzen* in the death of his brother *Cæſarius* towards the end of his oration, ſaith, *Every good ſoul looſed of the body, goes preſently* to the ſtate of bliſs, which he there deſcribes, ſuch as he believed his brother

—*quis tudor quæ confuſio?*

* Ambr. de bono Mortis c. 12.
*ibid. c. 10.

Dionyſ. Eccl. Hier. c. 7. parte 3.
—χειροσιδῆ λῆξιν.

Nazien. in Epitaphio fratris.
—λυθεῖσα—
εὐθὺς—

brother was gone to. And which is t
be noted, he brings in the former Affe
tion thus: *I believe the ſayings of the wi*
Every good ſoul being looſed &c. and fo
the *Purgation*, mark the Parentheſis h
there puts in, (*that whic*
(*Eo quod tenebras offunderet, purgato & depoſito: vel quo verbo ea res appellanda ſit,* Nazian. ibid. *did cauſe darkneſs, bein*
purged, and depoſed) whic
muſt be by death or ſepa
ration from body: *or b*
what word that thing is to be called,
know not.

Chryſ. in Mat. homil. 32. Ὁ παρὼν βίος. *Chryſoſt.* thus: *This preſent life is ſub*
ject to many ſorrows and troubles, but n
ſuch thing, ſaith he, *is ſpoken in Scriptur*
of the future: but there all grief flies away
*Chryſ. ad Philip. Serm. 3. μετα παυ-τας—

and * elſewhere ſpeaking of *Sinners* an
Righteous, he ſaith of theſe, *being gon*
from hence, they are with Chriſt face t
face— as the Apoſtle 2 *Cor.* 5. 7. ſaith
being abſent from the body we are preſen
with the Lord, And in another place, h
asks: what mean the *Lamps*, and *Hymns*
and *Prayers* (*viz.* at the Funeral of th
Dead) but as ſigns of joy to tell us, *Th*
Lord has crowned him: and has him wit
him. And in his 61. hom. in *Joan.* he
ſaith of the righteous man dying, (ἀπε-
λεύσεται μετ' Ἀγγέλων) he *goes away*
with the Angels, alluding to *Lazarus* his
Soul carried by Angels into *Abrams* Bo-
ſom.

Chryſ. ad Hebr. ſer. 4. —ἐστεφάνω-ται—παρ' ἑαυτῷ.

…m. All this and often thus he ſpeaks of …e *juſt man*, oppoſed to the *Sinner* that …es in his ſins without Repentance: (for …e uſually divides All men into theſe two …orts.) but ſuch righteous Men the Church …f *Rome* ſends to Purgatory. Δίκαιος ἁμαρτωλός.

Epiphanius, in the Hereſie of the *Ca-…ari*, ſhews that after this life ended, the …ondition is unalterable, *the receptacles …ealed up — the Crowns given* — Not …o, if ſouls truly penitent go to purgatory …or of ſuch ſouls he ſpeaks there againſt …he *Novatians*. Thus much of the *Place* of …ouls. Epiph. Hær. 39. Ἐσφράγισται τὰ ταμιεῖα--

We come now to the ſecond Head: IV. …hat is, *Prayer for the Dead*, from which …he Romaniſts would infer *Purgatory*. And for Scripture proof they give us 2 *Machab.* 12. 43. a fit foundation for ſuch an Article of Faith; the book of all the Apocryphals leaſt conſiderable; which will eaſily appear to him that layes together, what the Author himſelf ſaith of his own work, in his 2. chap. v. 23, 24, 26. and chap. 15. 38, 39. Evidences enough of a meer humane work, done by the labour of the brain not the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt. St. *Aug.* indeed ſometimes cals theſe books *Canonical* according to the large acception of the *African* Church: but having put to anſwer Prayers for the Dead, infer not Purgatory.

an

an argument of the *Donatist*, grounded upon the * example of *Razis*, he much lessens the Authority of them: as not to be compared with the books of the *Law*, and *Psalms*, and the *Prophets*; *to which* (saith he) *our Lord gives testimony, as to his Witnesses: But this writing of the Mach. is received of the Church not unprofitably if it be read soberly*— *Gregory* Bishop of *Rome* citing a place out of these Books, excuses it, because he did it out of Books *not Canonical*: in *Moral. l.* 19. *c.* 13.

* Machab.

Aug. contra Gauden l. 2. c. 23. —*quibus Dominus testimonium perhibet tanquam testibus suis.* Luc. 24 44. —*recepta non inutiliter, si sobrie legatur.*

Greg. Moral. l. 19. c. 13.

Again, he that well considers the place, will easily distinguish between the Fact of *Judas*, and the mistaken collection or misapplication of the writer of that Book. *Judas* no doubt did piously: for he seeing their Sin or Sacriledge, as the cause why they were slain: vers. 40. fell to his devotions; prayed and sent a sin-offering to *Jerusalem*, v. 42. 43. Not for the sin of them that died: that's the mistake of this Writer; but upon occasion of their sin, to divert the Wrath from the rest of his Army: as *Joshua* thought himself concerned, upon the sin of *Achan*, *Josh.* 7, 10. Also it is apparent that they died in their sin (the things they had stoln being found about

bout them) which argues both the *in-*
gitancy of this writer (who verſ. 45,
ppoſes they died godly) and the *imper-*
nency of the *Romaniſts*, who ſuppoſe
em in Purgatory, whither they ſend
one that dye in their ſins, but only juſti-
ied perſons.

They alſo urge 2 Tim. 1. 18. for pray-
ng for the Dead: whereas that prayer
r *Oneſiphorus* (ſuppoſing him dead at
hat time) has but reference to the *Mer-*
y, which ſhall be imparted at the laſt
ay; to which alſo the prayers of the
ncient Church do much refer, and make
othing for Purgatory. And therefore
ll the Teſtimonies they bring out of the
ncient Fathers or Councils for praying
or the Dead are impertinent as to the
roving of a Purgatory: there being
ther Reaſons for ſuch praying; as we
hall ſee. A wilful perverting it is of
hat Ancient Practice, to draw it off (as
he Church of *Rome* has done) from the
rſt intent and purpoſe, to faſten it upon
heir conceit of Purgatory pains. We
hall ſee this better by the trial follow-
ing.

V. Other purpoſes of ſuch Prayers.

The Ancients, when they ſet themſelves to give reaſons of the Churches praying for the Dead, give not this of Purgatory, (which had been moſt obvious and

and most fit to stop the mouth of the Adversary, had it been the Doctrine of the Church) but other Reasons they alledge differing from, or inconsistent with purgatory. This appears by *Epiphanius*, who was put to it by *Aerius* questioning the prayers made in the Church for the Dead: and by *Dionysius* in his *Hierarchy*, who puts himself to answer the like Questions. In both of them it appears, that the intent of the Church by those Prayers was mainly this: The *instruction* of the living and the *confirming* of their Hope. See first what *Epiphanius* saith.

Epiph. Har. 75. σεμνότατον κήρυγμα.

He cals this practice a *seemly preaching* or publishing: of what? of the happy estate and Rest of those that dye in Christ: whereby the belief of the living was confirmed and their hope raised. *What more profitable*, saith he, *then that the living should believe, they that are departed are in being, and do live with the Lord.* And again, *There is hope*, saith he, *to them while they pray for their Brethren, as now in their peregrination* or absence: Insinuating that albeit they are departed or gone from them, yet they shall meet again. Also to shew τὸ ἐντελέστερον, *that which is more perfect:*

--τὸς παρόντας πιστεύειν, ὅτ' ἀπελδόντες εἰσὶ ζῶσι—

Ἐλπίς ἐστιν ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν εὐχομένοις--

perfect: which must refer to the state of the next life: *for*, saith he, *while we are here in the world, we offend often.* And lastly, because all men do *offend and slip* in this life more or less, therefore *we pray for all even for Patriarchs*, &c. *to separate Christ from all other*; for he being without sin altogether, is not to be prayed for, but to be prayed unto, and worshipped. These are all the Reasons he gives of their praying for the Dead: which we see do respect and provide for the instruction of the Living: and do not imply any such state of the Dead in pain and grief, as Purgatory supposeth, but the Contrary.

διὰ τὸ πολλάκις ἐν κόσμῳ ὄντας σφάλλεσθαι.

—ἵνα τὸν Κύριον ἀφορίσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἁγίους τάξεως.

Now see we, what the *Romanists* endeavour to pick out of words; Because he saith, *Prayer for the Dead is profitable, although it cuts not off sins, all or wholly*: they infer thence, *therefore it doth cut off sin in part*. We answer, As *Epiphanius* does not say that, so neither could he mean it: For first, we must suppose he would not answer impertinently to *Aerius*, who objected, *If the prayers of the living altogether profit the Dead, then let no man live Godly*, &c. Therefore *Epiphanius* his τὰ ἔλα must answer to *Aerius* his ὅλως, and must

Εἰ καὶ τὰ ὅλα τῆς ἁμαρτίας μὴ ἀποκόπτοι. Epiph. ibid.

Εἰ γὰρ ὅλως εὐχαὶ τῆς ἐνταῦθα τοῖς ἐκεῖσε ὠφελοῦσι, μηδεὶς εὐσεβείτω—

be

be understood of the sins of such persons as *Aerius* spoke of, such as had no care of their lives, but left it to their living friends to pray for them after death. Now if *Epiphanius* should mean, that prayer did in part cut off such mens sins, then must he speak according to that *merciful opinion*, of mitigating the pains of the Damned by the prayers of the Living; with which conceit some of the Ancients were tainted: as we shall see below; but this would be nothing to *Purgatory*. Secondly, if his meaning had been, (as the *Romanists* would have it) that prayer for the Dead did not cut off such mens sins: but that there was another sort of sinners, whose sins and punishment it does in part cut off, (*viz.* such as have not fully satisfied here, but must do it elsewhere) then would *Epiphanius* (had he known such Doctrine) have much forgotten himself, and betrayed the Church in not stopping the mouth of the Adversary therewith. To conclude; *Epiphanius* his answer to *Aerius* must come to this: Albeit Prayer for the Dead doth not (as you misconceive the intent of it) cut off such mens sins, yet is it for other reasons profitable; for such as were above recited.

Another thing they object out of *Epiphanius* his words: that he saith, *We pray for*

sinners, and implore mercy of God for ; but such sinners, say they, must be purgatory. Answ. *Epiphanius* doth t say, *we pray for sinners*, but *we make ention of the just, and also of sinners:* and sinners, as *imploring the mercy of God.* gain, let the word (λεόμενοι) stand, hich some queston as put for (θεώμενοι) oking unto or looking at the mercy of od; and let it sound, as they would ve it, an imploring of Gods mercy: d let it have respect to the forgiveness the Dead, which yet *Epiphanius* doth t say, but seems rather to direct it to e instruction of the living, to shew, that rasmuch as *we offend all in this world* s above noted) we all need mercy: I y let all these be granted, it would a-ount to no more then that which *Dio-ysius* speaks of their praying for the ead at his carrying forth to burial: *at all his sins committed rough humane weakness ay be forgiven him, and placed in light in the Re-ion of the living, in* Abra-ams *bosom.* And now see hat this Author saith of that praying or the Dead, suitable to *Epiphanius* his ccount of it.

Ποιέμεθα ὑπὲρ μνήμων. — ὑπὲρ ἐλέους Θεοῦ λεόμενοι.

Dionys. Eccles. Hierar. c. 7. parte tertia. πάντα μὲ ἀφεῖναι δ' ἀνθρωπίνῳ ἀδυνειαν ἡμαρτημένα. Κατατάξαι ὃ αὐτὸν ἐν φωτί—

He

—μεταπαχθήσεσθαι ἀπὸ ἢ ἀξίαν ἀπῆ. Dionys. ibid.

He there by way of objection puts t
Question: *By what prayers of the Bi*
or Priest can he (the Dead person)
transferred into any other seat or state, th
he deserves to be in? How obvious h
the Answer of *Purgatory* been here, h
it been known doctrine then? But n
thing is said by him to that purpose: h
Reasons (as *Epiphan.* above) implyi
that the intent of such praying was mai
ly to give hope and instruction to the
ving. First, he insinuates, In vain is t
benefit of such prayers expected by tho
who are careless of the precepts, *i. e.* wh
live not well. Then, that the Bishop
priest in so praying, *is t*
Interpreter or publisher
the Divine judgments: vi
in giving rewards *accordi*
as men deserve— and ho
that? *the divine loving kin*
ness in great goodness ove
looks their infirmities or spo
and stains of sin contracted by human
weakness. Thus that prayer which beg
all his sins may be forgiven, is doctrine t
the living, shewing and assuring them o
Gods mercy to them that strive to liv
well, notwithstanding through human
weakness they offend often, and can
no

—ἐπφανεικός ὅτι περὶ διαρχικῶν δικαιωμάτων,

—περὶ ἀξίαν.

—παρρώσης ἀγαθότητι ἢ φιλανθρωπίας τὰς ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνης ἀσθενείας κηλίδας.

be free from all ſpots and ſtains of

hen in relation as it ſeems, to the other
of the Prayer, which begg'd, that *he*
ot be placed in light, &c. this Author
s. The Biſhop or Prieſt *knows ſuch*
things are promiſed, and * *therefore*
yes, that they may come
paſs, and be given to them,
have lived well. Alſo,
knowes that the good
ngs promiſed will come to
, and therefore † *as the*
terpreter of Gods will. he ſhewes they
ll ſurely be made good to them that ſo
e and die. This is the very ſum of his
ſwer, which plainly ſpeaks comfort
d inſtruction to the living. His con-
ſion is this: *Wherefore* the Biſhop or
miſter *prayes for thoſe things which are*
miſed of God, and * *are*
be rendred and performed;
which † *he declares both*
the good diſpoſition of his own
inde to God, and to thoſe
that are preſent, the good
things, which ſhall be to the Saints. So ſtill
the end of thoſe prayers was (as *Epipha-*
nius call'd it ὑπόμνημα) a preaching or In-
ſtruction to the Living that were pre-
ſent.

* Αἰτεῖ ὁ μυήσας, καὶ δωρηθῆναι τοῖς ὁσίως βιώσασι.

† Τοῖς παροῦσιν ἐναργεστέρως ἐμφαίνων—

* Πάντως δωρηθησόμεθα.

† Ἐπιδεικνὺς-- καὶ τοῖς παροῦσιν ἐναργεστέρως ἐμφαίνων τὰ τοῖς ὁσίοις ἐσόμενα.

Now

Now these instructions for the livi
and Indications of the will of God, a
their own good disposition, They ga
out by way of *prayer* and *wishing*, rath
then by bare *Assertion* of the happy est
of them, that dye in Christ: because t
did not only speak such Truths, but
also witness their compliance of desi
and signifie their affection towards t
Deceased, and shew their complacen
and congratulation in and for the hap
estate of the Deceased; that mutual w
wishing, which is between the Membe
of the same body, the Church. It w
more prompt, as to the expressing
their own affection; and more profitab
as they thought, for the Living, to spea
by way of Prayer, what the departed had
then by bare assertion.

If it be objected, (as it is sometim
by the defenders of Purgatory,) that th
like Prayers were made for the Dead, no
only at the departure and Funeral, bu
every year afterward; and therefore mus
suppose them in such a state, or plac
wherein they wanted still *forgiveness*, and
light: the things prayed for. This infe
rence is inconsequent; for still there
may be like intent in the yearly using
those Prayers, as was before expressed;
the *shewing of their hope* of them that
were

re Departed, *the inſtruction of the Li-*
y. But the *Cardinal* alſo will furniſh Bel. lib. 2.
with another Anſwer; for being put de purgat.
clear an objection ariſing from a c. 5.
yer in their *Maſs* for the Dead:
ich runs thus (*Deliver O Lord the*
ls *of all the faithfull departed from the*
ws *of Hell, from the deep Lake, from the*
uth *of the Lyon—*) and ſeems not to
ree to Souls in *purgatory*, which they
d are delivered from *Hell*, and ſure
Heaven; He anſwereth firſt, *That al-*
the Souls in Purgatory
ve received their firſt ſen-
ce already in their parti-
lar Judgment: and by
at ſentence are delivered
om Hell; yet there is a
neral Judgment behinde,
which they muſt receive a ſecond ſen-
nce. It is a Truth indeed and Catholick
Doctrine, that ſentence for Mercy or
Condemnation is paſſed both in the firſt
ppearing of the Soul before God at
eath, and after at the Reſurrection or
eneral Judgment, when the ſentence is
pronounced openly and before all the
World: and to theſe, the Prayers made
t the Funeral and afterward, may refer
without ſuppoſing Purgatory: for this
nſwer of the *Cardinal* though he ap-

Etiamſi jam acceperint primam ſententiam in particulari judicio, eaque Sententia liberæ ſunt a Gehenna: reſtat tamen Generale, in quo ſecundam accepturi—

plies

plies it to ſouls in Purgatory, will fit
faithful Souls going immediately to bli
Again, he anſwers. *The Church uſe*
the ſame manner of ſpeech (in prayi
yearly for the Dead) *as if their Sou*
were then going out of their bodies, or
their paſſage. So then prayers ancient
made for the Dead year by year, need n
ſuppoſe their Souls were in Purgatory
for ſuch prayers may have (as the Ca
dinal yields) no other meaning then the
had at the Obit or Funeral of ſuch pe
ſons: which was to accompany them
it were to Gods Tribunal, and to inſtru
the Living, by ſhewing them, what the
that dye in Chriſt have, *forgiveneſs, ligh*
reſt, joy.

Thus much for *Epiphanius* and *Dion*
ſius, who on ſet purpoſe give us an ac
count of this practiſe in the Church: b
which we ſee, Their Prayers as the
might be *Petitions* for what the Departe
were yet to receive, ſo were they *Cel*
brations and Congratulations in regar
of what they had received, and in bot
inſtruction to the living for confirming
their faith and Hope as to the happy ſtat
of thoſe that dy in Chriſt: And by thi
alſo is apparent, what was intended by
Offering the ſacrifice of the Altar for th
Dead, as they uſed to ſpeak: No more
then

n the remembering of them in their
yers there and then offered up. But
re to this purpose in the next point.

Again; The Prayers of the Church for
e Dead must in all reason refer to such
ate of the Dead as was then known
taught: which as we saw above, was
onsistent with Purgatory.

First, It was held by many, that the
ls of the faithful were kept in a secret
eptacle till the Resurrection: and it
probable that this opinion being so an-
ent, gave the first beginning to these
yers for the Dead, the most ancient
ms of which begin with a *Memento*
mine, Remember them Lord, because
ey held such souls not yet admitted to
ods presence; and did beg, that God
ould give them *Refreshment*, because of *Refrigeri-*
r burning desire they have to the time *um.*
their Resurrection: and *Light*, because *Lucem.*
ey had not yet the heavenly light of
e beatifical Vision: This is that *stay* or
ication of the resurrection, which *Ter-* *Mora resur-*
ullian speaks of sometimes. *rectionis.*
Tertul.

Secondly, It was held by most (as above
lso was shewen) that the Souls of Just
nd godly persons, dying in Christ, went
o bliss & heavenly happiness: who at the
st day should rise first, and receive their
ublick and final acquittance, and con-
summation.

ſummation. And certainly the Ancien Church, in her prayers for the Dead, ha ſpecial relation to the Day of Judgemen and Reſurrection, finding how much it referred to in Scripture. 2 *Tim.* 1. 1 18. and *cap.* 4. 8. and elſewhere.

VI. The Sacrifice of the Altar: or offering of the Euchariſt.

And to this did alſo refer the offerin of the Sacrifice of the Euchariſt for them which implyed firſt, *praiſe and thanks giving* for all that were departed in th true Faith of Chriſt, Patriarchs, Prophets Apoſtles, Martyrs, and all other, tha *were at reſt in Chriſt:* This is that offe ring, *pro dormitione*, for the *ſleeping* of ſuch which we meet with in St. *Cyprian*, tha God had taken ſuch a one out of th worlds troubles, and given him reſt i Chriſt; Secondly, *Supplication* by vertu of that once offered All-ſufficient Sacrifi to beg all the mercies and *good things pro miſed*; *That they and we may attain to th good things promiſed*, ſaith St. *Chryſoſt* and ſo *Dionyſius* ſpake of the prayer made with reſpect to the *good things pro miſed* (as we ſaw above) ſuch was a joy ful reſurrection, a final acquittance, a Con ſummation in bliſs: *the mercy to be found in that day*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. and ſo it was *pro dormitione*, for their *ſleeping* too by way of ſupplication. For that phraſe of St. *Cyprian*, cannot imply prayer and ſupplication

ἀναπαυομένοις. *Quieſcentibus in Chriſto.*

Chryſ. in fine Hom. 24. in Act.

plication properly (for who can be properly to pray for *the sleeping* of a one, when he is dead?) but only regard of the *good things* which he that *in Christ*, shall receive at his awaking. In the Liturgy going under the Name of St. *James*: thus, *Remember Lord all the faithful — from* Abel *the — Make them to rest in the Region the living, in the delights of Paradise, thy Kingdom* — This cannot suppose ese souls to be in Purgatory, for the manists cannot suppose *Abel* and the her Patriarchs to be in such a place. in St. *Mark's* Liturgy, for *Apostles*, *Martyrs*, *Confessors*, it is thus prayed: *ve them*, O Lord, *rest in thy King-*; So in the ancient Canon of the lse: *Remember Lord thy servants, ich sleep in the rest of peace.* Now some of the Ancient prayers mentio- Patriarchs, Apostles, Martyrs: so of them were made for those that re *at rest* in Christ, and could not ply them to be in Purgatory. Nor is it re implied, that they wholly wanted ese things that are prayed for, but that ey might fully and consummately reive and enjoy, what already they had part and in some measure.

Memento Domine omnium — ab Abel justo — facito eos requiescere &c.

Dona iis requiem in regno tuo. Memento famulorum — qui dormiunt in somno pacis.

Reason of remembring the Dead in the offering of the Altar or Eucharist.

The Reason of this remembring o the Faithful, that are departed, is be cause all the Faithful Dead and Aliv belong to the same body: and do there fore wish and desire mutually the good which each other are capable of: they i bliss interceding for the Church below and we below glorifying God for the reception into bliss, and intreating fo their consummation, and the complea ting of Christs Kingdom: and this mo especially in the participation of his bod and bloud; in which all the members o the Church have their Interest, and b which they receive what they have o shall have. St. *August.* speaking of th Kingdom of Christ above and below, sait to this purpose: *For neither are the Souls of the godly (which are dead) separated from the Church, which now is the Kingdom of Christ: Otherwise there would be no remembrance made of them at the Altar of God in the communication of the body of Christ.*

Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 20. c. 9. *Neque enim anima Piorum mortuorum separantur ab Ecclesia quæ nunc est regnum Christi: Alioqui nec ad Altare Dei fieret eorum memoria in communicatione corporis Christi.*

Thirdly, it was a known Truth, held and taught in the Church: that Souls after departure from the body do appear before Gods tribunal and receive their first

ſt and particular judgment: therefore ayers were made for Mercy and Remiſ- n at or in reference to their paſſage thi- r: the Living as it were accompany- them with their prayers, wiſhes, inter- ſſions; Thus they prayed at the Burial carrying out of the Dead: and did as we ſaw above, for the reaſons there entioned, *viz.* the inſtruction of the ing and confirming of their hope, and monſtration of their affection, and the e: And upon the like reſpects they arly repeated the like prayers, as we nted above, out of the *Cardinal*, ac- owledging as much.

Laſtly it was a private opinion, but no- ious and held by many: That they ich died in their ſins without true faith d repentance might at length be reco- ed out of their Pains, or at leaſt have em mitigated. And to theſe, the Prayers r the Dead, which begged forgiveneſs, ſe or releaſe were (I do not ſay refer- d by the Church, but) applied or rather iſapplied by many. *Origen* gave occa- on firſt to this Error; for he held that ll ſhould at length come out of their orments: and his Error was, as *Vincen-* notes, a great temptation to the hurch, by reaſon of the wit and parts of

VII. That the Damned had benefit or eaſe by the Prayers of the Church, a private opinion or miſapplication.

Aug. Enchirid. cap. III. *Frustra quamplurimi æternam damnatorum pœnam miserantur affectu—*

the Author, and St. *Aug.* tels us in several places that many were of this *merciful opinion*. *Very many*, saith he, *do commiserate through humane affection, the eternal sufferings of the damned, and do not believe it will be so*, &c. Of these also in other places, especially in his work *Of the City of God*: *l.* 21. *c.* 17, 18, 19, 20. where he reckons five latitudes in the extent of that Opinion, refuting them all.

Greg. Nyssen seems to be deeply tainted with that merciful opinion, and is noted for it by the Greeks in their Apology against the Romish Purgatory made and given out in the time of the Council of *Florence*: for that * Father seems plainly to assert the restoring of all men to salvation: and in another place speaks of *the purging of some, and their turning to God after death*, who were *impure* in their lives. And that place of St. *Hieron.* upon *Isa.* 66. *ult.* which the *Cardinal* misapplies to Purgatory (for it plainly speaks of wicked Christians) does shew some tincture of that *merciful opinion*: Now it is plain that *Chrysostome* applies the Prayers and oblations made for the Dead, to such sinners; And I should choose rather to silence those errors and mistakes of some ancient Fathers: did not the importuni-

* Nyssen in orat. *Deus omnia in omnibus.* Idem in orat. de Mortuis. pag. 1067. *Mixtam clementiæ sententiam—*

of the *Romaniſts* force us to ſhew the miſapplication of them to Purgatory: I ſhall inſiſt therefore in ſome paſſages of S. *Chryſoſtome*. The ſinners he ſpeaks of be prayed for, are in ſeveral Homilies, wards the End of them, thus ſet forth by him. *One*, ſaith he, *that daily offended God. One that lived every day to his own pleaſure. One that died in his riches, and never uſed them* to the benefit of his ſoul. *One that was* (ἀναφαιρεμένος) *cut off and loſt*: and of whom he ſaith (Hom. 32. in *Mat.*) *If God had ſeen he would have changed, he would not have cut him off before his Repentance*: Such as theſe the *Romaniſts* will not ſay, that they go to Purgatory but to Hell; yet of theſe he ſaith, *Let us mourn for ſuch a one; but that avails not: Let us help him as we can.* How is that? *by prayers and alms; thoſe things muſt be done, which may bring ſome comfort and eaſe to him.* To this tenour he ſpeaks in all the places above cited: but eſpecially in Hom. 21. upon the *Acts*: *Shall we not try* (ſaith he of one that lived to himſelf and

Hom. 61. in Jo. Hom. 21. in Act. Serm. 3. in Philip.

—ἔζησε τῇ ἡδυφῇ, τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, τῷ διαβόλῳ—

—ἐν πλούτῳ τετελευτηκότα.

εἰ δὲ ἦν εἰ μεταβαλλόμενον ὁ θεὸς ἦδη προνήρπασε τῆς μετανοίας.

Βοηθῶμεν κατὰ δύναμιν.

—πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς ἀν-

—ὑπὲρ τίνων ἐξαρτάσαι! ἔστι γὰρ ὅτε, ἐὰν θέλωμεν, κούφων αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τὰς κόλασεις.

the Devil) *to rescue him from the dangers and evils he is encompassed with? for there is a way, if we will to make his punishment lighter*; and this by making prayer for him, and almsdeeds. *and these*, saith he, *so much the more, as he was guilty of the more sins.* And this he takes to be *doctrine suitable to the loving kindness of God towards man.* And then a little after he adds, Though we be not *vertuous* ourselves, yet let *us get friends* that will do this for us, *when we are gone.* Then presently follows, * *Oblations are not in vain, nor Supplications, nor Almsdeeds. All these things the Spirit has ordained willing* or commanding, *that we should help one another:* Then he mentions the Offering of the Eucharist, and saith; *It is not the Minister simply* (or only) *that praies so for those that are faln asleep in Christ: It is not he only that sends forth that voice, but the Spirit. He indeed holds the Offering or Sacrifice in his hands*, &c. And so goes on expressing the honour to be then remembred, and the power and efficacy

— ὅσῳ πλείονων γέγονεν ἁμαρτημάτων ὑπεύθυνος.

Τοῦτο τὸ δόγμα τῆς θείας φιλανθρωπίας.

—— εὐαρεστεῖ.

*—οὐκ εἰκῇ συνεφρόντισε ταῦτα πάντα τὸ πνεῦμα διέταξε, δι' ἀλλήλων ἡμᾶς ὠφελεῖσθαι βουλόμενον.

—ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων.

—ἐν χερσὶ θυσίαν.

efficacy of Christs death, then represented.

Where we may observe; that this saying of his, *The Spirit has ordained all these things* (which the *Romanists* do much urge, as if their prayers and offerings for souls in Purgatory were by an *Ordinance of the Spirit*) relates to the *help of one another by Prayers, Oblations and Almsdeeds:* which in general is true, so far as we are capable to be helped by them. But if it be particularly applied to the helping of such sinners as before he had spoken of, it makes nothing for the *Romanists*, for they will not allow that the Prayers and Oblations of the Living do avail or help such as died in their sins; but if it be applied to the Prayers and Offerings in the Eucharist, as he seems here to intend it, it makes nothing still for them or against us; for we allow that Ancient practice of remembring there, and praying as they did for *those that sleep in Christ.* The intent and purpose of those prayers he expresses in the close of his speech, *that they and we*, saith he, *may obtain the good things promised, through the Grace and merciful loving kindness of our Saviour Christ.*

— ἵνα κἀκεῖνοι κἀ ἡμεῖς τύχωμεν ὧν ἐπηγγείλατο χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ —

A place parallel to the former he hath

in his third Hom. on the *Epiſt.* to the *Philip.* where ſpeaking of *Prayers and Oblations,* with reſpect to the Dead, *Theſe things,* ſaith he, *were not in vain ordained by the Apoſtles: that a remembrance be made of thoſe that are dead in the moſt reverend and holy Myſteries: For when all the people ſtand, and the company of Prieſts with their hands ſtretch'd out toward heaven, and the great ſacrifice lies before them, how ſhall we not then move and make God propitious, while we pray for them that are departed?* Here again the *Romaniſts* triumph, as if St. *Chryſoſt.* made their praying for Souls in purgatory an *Ordinance of the Apoſtles:* whereas he plainly reſtrains this *Ordinance of the Apoſtles,* as above he did the *Ordinance of the Spirit,* to that which the Church did in the Holy Euchariſt; and that concerned only them, who were at *reſt in Chriſt:* Nothing of Souls in pains and torment is mentioned in the Ancient Liturgies, or Prayers of the Church. As for this Fathers ſpeaking of prayer for ſuch ſinners, as he deſcribed in all the forementioned places, ſuch as were gone to endleſs pains, yet might receive as he thought, a little eaſe thereby: we muſt reckon it as a private

Chryſ. in Phil. hom. 3. ἐκ εἰκῆ ταῦτα ἐνομοθέτησαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι; τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς φρικτῶν μυστηρίων μνήμην γίνεσθαι τῶν ἀπελθόντων.

ne opinion, and misapplication of that practise of praying for the Dead. And indeed he seems to acknowledge so much himself; for in his forementioned *Hom. 21. in Jo.* he saith, in relation to those his exhortations for such prayers and offerings, *These things I speak not as one giving precept or setting a Law: but as one allowing, and condescending* to the affections and frailties of men. ταῦτα δ' οὐ νόμου θέσεως λέγω ἀλλὰ συγγνώμης—

The *Romanists* here reply: that St. *Chrysost.* and others seem to urge Prayer for all: because they knew not who died in the state of repentance: and so they pray for all in the Church of *Rome*, yet hold those prayers appliable to, and available for only those that dye in that state, and go to Purgatory pains. This is a meer shift, for St. *Chrysost.* does plainly suppose, that those sinners he speaks of died in their sins, such, *as if God had seen they would have changed, he would not have cut them off before their repentance*, as we had it above; such as he in another place speaks thus of, of *such a one there is no cause to rejoyce, but only, because the course of his wicked life is cut off*: yet for such he exhorts to pray and offer, and help him as they can. And indeed the reason of this extending the benefit of Prayers to such sinners was not any supposal of Purgatory Chrys. hom. 61. in Jo. ὅτι ἐνεκόπη τὰ τῆς κακίας αὐτῦ.

gatory, but of some mitigating and easing of those eternal pains, to which such sinners were adjudged: and this in part according to that merciful opinion, and the motion of humane affection, of which St. *Aug.* speaks in his Enchiridion, C. 111. as we noted above; and to which affection St. *Chrysost.* gives too much scope, as we see in the forementioned passages of prayers & oblations for such sinners. But as for Purgatory pains, which are supposed to begin at death, & to end before the resurrection, he knew no such pains, as evidently appears by that exact distribution of the several sorts of punishments, made by this Father and cited below Nu. 11.

What we have said of some expressions of *Chrysost.* applying prayer and relief to such sinners as before were described, may be said of that place, which the *Romanists* much urge out of St. *Cyril,* who tels us, *they prayed simply for all:* and accounted it *a great help to those souls, for which the prayer of the great and holy sacrifice was offered:* and the great power, which that prayer hath to help, he sets out by the similitude of a King intreated to pardon and call back one that is banished; *According to the same manner* (saith he) *we praying for sinners, render God propitious.* Now if it be *after the same manner,* then by

Cyril. Myst. catech. 5. ἢ ὅτε πάντων ἁπλῶς — μεγίστην ὄντως —

Ἐπ' αὐτὴν πρόπον ἡμεῖς —

by the force of this ſimilitude it muſt be implyed, that the prayers of the Church may obtain pardon for ſinners *not reconciled* to God before their death, for ſo the baniſhed perſon is ſuppoſed to be, not reconciled to his Prince: and then it ſounds to like purpoſe as thoſe paſſages in *Chryſoſtom* did, and is but a private application or miſapplication of that Ancient practiſe: neither agreeable to the intent of the Ancient Church, remembring in her prayers and offerings only thoſe, that were *at reſt in Chriſt*, as by the Forms of thoſe prayers may appear: nor making any thing for Purgatory, which ſuppoſes the perſon reconciled and juſtified before he comes there.

But if the *Sinners* (which *Cyril* here ſaith are prayed for) be taken in a more remiſs ſenſe, for ſuch as the *Romiſh* Church ſends to purgatory: then the praying for them, comes to no more, then what we ſaid above to *Epiphanius* and *Dionyſius*; that ſuch prayer had reference to the paſſage of ſuch ſouls, and their appearing in judgment, not to their being in pains after death; For that ſuch perſons muſt appear in judgment, the firſt and the laſt judgment, and undergo a ſcrutiny or examination, and have as it were *their hay and ſtubble burnt up*, was a Catho-

Catholick Truth: but that persons *reconciled* to God, *dying and resting* in Christ, should presently go to pain and torment was no doctrine of the Church, and therefore the prayers of the Church could not refer unto such persons. And we may observe that the undoubted *Cyril* (for those Mystagogical Catechismes are thought to be composed by *John* B. of Jerusalem) tels us that Christ, when he comes to judgment shall draw after him *a flood of trying fire*, which shall burn up all *hay and stubble of their Actions*. So that if such sinners be prayed for, it must be with reference to the fire of trial and examination, which they are to undergo in the day of Judgment, and according to the true *Cyril*. Thus much for that practise of the Church *praying for the Dead*: that it does not prove a belief of Purgatory, but was used upon other Reasons.

Cyril. Catech. 15.

ποταμὸν πυρὸς δοκιμαστικὸν — καλαμώδη πρᾶξιν.

VIII. The third general Head was *Forgiveness of sins after Death*: out of which the *Romanists* would conclude a Purgatory. The Text of Scripture is our Saviours speech *Mat.* 12. 32. *it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.* Here they are bound to make good three things. 1. That *the world to come*, signifies the Time beginning at every

Forgiveness of sins after death or in the world to come.

mans

mans death. 2. That from our Saviours Negative, *nor in the world to come*, this affirmative followes, therefore *there are some sins shall be forgiven in the World to come.* 3. That if some sins shall be forgiven, then to them to whom they shall be forgiven, *there remains pain and torment to be suffered.*

Of the world to come.

1. For the Time. The *world to come* is no where put for the Time between every mans death and the Resurrection: for so it would be *present* to some and *future* to others; but is every where *seculum futurum*, which is so to every one: whether it be taken according to the *Jewish* acception, or the Christian. With the *Jewes*, *the world to come*, did sometimes signifie, the Time of their exspected Messiah; and indeed that place of *Isa.* 9. 6. where the Messiah is called *Pater futuri seculi* the father of the Age or world to come: to *whom a generation shall be accounted*, Ps. 22. 30. does accord thereunto. Now it was an opinion among the *Jewes* (as they that are acquainted with their Rabbins do tel us) that some sins should then be forgiven, which could not before: and accordingly it was an usual expression, by saying such a sin shall not be forgiven, no not in the world to come, to shew the Atrocity and flagitiousness of such

such a sin, which the grace that the Messiah should bring, would not take away: and so our Saviour might speak this *ad hominem*, according to their common opinion and saying, to express the hainousness of that sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

But take this Phrase according to the tenour of the New Testament which supposes the *Messiah* come already, *The world to come*, every where signifies that which begins at the Resurrection, or last day of this world. Then is fixed the *End of this world*, *Mat.* 13. 39. 40. & *cap.* 28. 20. and then begins *the world to come*, *Marc.* 10. 30. *Luc.* 18. 30. *Eph.* 1. 21. And so it must be taken by St. *Aug.* in that place which the *Romanists* cite, as to their purpose, *for the forgiveness of sins not forgiven before: Otherwise,* saith he, *it could not be truly said of some: it shall not be forgiven neither in this world, nor in the world to come:* for if we inquire of him, when shall this be? He tels us there, *after the Resurrection is done.* And so also *Futurum seculum, the world to come*, is taken both by *Greeks* and *Latins* * in their debate of this point.

Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 21. c. 24. *Neque enim de quibusdam veraciter diceretur, non remittetur—*

—facta resurrectione.

* Concil. Flor. Sess. 1. de Purgatorio.

II. For

II. For their inference from our Saviours Negative, *Not forgiven* (ſaith he) *in the world to come, therefore*, ſay they, *there are ſins to be forgiven in the world to come*: The *Cardinal* acknowledges it does not follow according to the *Rules of Logick*: Indeed ſuch forgiveneſs, as they pretend in relation to Purgatory cannot in any *reaſon* follow upon our Saviours ſpeech. That there is a forgiveneſs of ſins after death cannot be denied, ſo long as we believe there is a *Judgment of God* to come; for when that comes, and paſſes upon the Souls of men, either privately at their death, or openly at the Laſt day, there is an *abſolution* of ſome, and a *condemnation* of others: a *forgiving*, and a *not forgiving* in the world to come: whether we begin that Time at the day of Death, or of Reſurrection; but this forgiveneſs is nothing to Purgatory. Of the Forgiveneſs.

Again, This forgiveneſs or not forgiveneſs of ſins in the world to come may have regard to the forgiveneſs or retaining of ſins by Man in the Miniſtry of reconciliation in this life; ſo there is a looſing and binding on Earth, and a looſing and binding in Heaven: in like manner a declaration of ſins forgiven in the Church in this life, and a declaration of ſins forgiven or not forgiven in the world to come.

For

For then it shall appear, that many sins forgiven by Man, (*Clave errante*, through misapplication of the *Keyes*) are not forgiven of God, but shall receive sentence of condemnation; and many that have been unjustly excommunicated and condemned here, shall be owned and absolved there. And so in this respect it may be said truly, that whoever will continue obstinate, and rebel against light, as they that here blasphemed against the Holy Ghost, must not expect to have his sin forgiven, either in this life by the Church, or in the world to come, when God shall appear in judgment, and so it comes to what St. *Marc.* saith, *he hath never forgiveness*: and what St. *Hier.* saith upon the place; *This blasphemy shall never be forgiven him.*

Hier. in Mat. 5. *Huic nullo tempore blasphemia remittetur.*

Venial Sins.

The Sins which the *Romanists* will have forgiven in the next life, are *Venial* or light sins. But why these forgiven in the next world when the great sins are forgiven in this life (as they acknowledge) unto those justified persons, whom they send to Purgatory? why should such small sins, which do not cut off the state of justification, or put the person out of the favour of God, be retained and call'd to so severe a reckoning, as is that of the Purgatory Prison? It is true, that sanctified

ed persons after their Justification, are ubject to the daily subreption of such ighter sins: but seeing, as St. *Aug.* saith ften, we do for them daily confess and y, *Forgive us our debts*— why should ot the general repentance and confession ith which such Persons dye, be available o the forgiveness of all such failings and ecret sins, (that cannot be remembred particular) through the merit of Christs erfect obedience, apprehended by the ith of such justified persons?

The stain or remaining corruption of Sin.

And as for the stains of sinful corruption, yet remaining after forgiveness of the guilt and punishment: (the doing away of which the *Romanists* call forgiveness) what need is there of a Fire to purge them away? for it is not fire but the grace of God, likened unto fire, that can work that effect upon the soul. And why may not *final grace*, as some call it, do away the remaining corruption, at the parting of soul and body? They acknowledge that *grace infused* does it in the first Justification: not only taking away the guilt but the stain and corruption too; and why may it not do so, in the last infusion or communication? They acknowledge also that the stain of *original* Sin comes upon the Soul in a moment at the conjunction of it with the body: and why

why may not the *contracted* ſtains an blots of ſin, be by the grace of God don away at the ſeparation of ſoul and body All this is far more reaſonable to ſay, the from our Saviours ſpeech *not forgiven*, t infer, *ſome ſhall be then forgiven:* an from that forgiveneſs, to conclude ſuc a Purgation of Souls as they imagine More *reaſonable*, I ſay; though not ſ *prudential*, it may be, conſidering wha is gained by it in the *Romiſh* Church. Fo hear what the *Cardinal* ſaith of that *In ference* of the *affirmative (ſhall be forgi ven)* from our Saviours *Ne gative (ſhall not be forgiven)*

Bel. l. 1. de Purgat. c. 4. *Non ſecundum Regulas Logicæ, ſed ſequi ſecundum regulam prudentiæ, alioqui faceremus Dominum ineptiſſimè locutum —*

It doth not follow, ſaith he *according to the Rules of Lo gick* (that is of *Reaſon*), *but i follows according to the Rule of Prudence: Elſe ſhould we make our Lor ſpeak inconſiderately in ſaying*, neither in this world nor in the world to come. For their *Prudence* in drawing *Purgator* out of ſo many pretended places of Scripture beſides the *Rules of Logick* or Reaſon, we envy it not; but it was neither *Prudent* nor ſeemly for the Cardinal to conclude, that unleſs ſuch Inference were good, our Saviour had ſpoken *inconſiderately*, or (as his word ſounds) *fooliſhly*; whereas we ſaw above, our Savi-

our

might ſpeak ſo in many reſpects, without reference to any ſuch Purgatory: reſpect to the Age of the *Meſſiah*, according to the opinion of the Jewes; In reſpect to the *General judgment* of God, and the ſentence then to be paſſed: In reſpect to the *forgiveneſs* of ſins, and that *loſing* made on earth. Another reſpect we may add, and ſay our Saviour might ſpeak ſo in regard of the *puniſhment* of the world to come: which is the neceſſary conſequent of *not forgiven*; *ſhall not be forgiven, i. e. ſhall be puniſhed.* So *Fenn* on the place; and *Chryſoſtom.* And this will bring us to their Inference from theſe words which was the third thing they were to make good: and it is directly contrary to that of St. *Chryſoſtom.*

III. They infer Purgatory pains from the forgiveneſs, which they ſuppoſe to be in the world to come: *forgiven, i. e. puniſhed.* This is inconſequent and inconſiſtent.

Firſt, in regard of the Time, for the forgiveneſs of the world to come, is that final open abſolution or forgiveneſs at the laſt day: but their Purgatory forgiveneſs and puniſhment is ſecret and before that laſt day. But here they ſeem to anſwer; that ſins indeed are forgiven at the laſt day, but to them that have firſt paſſed

sed the Purgatory fire; and for this
obscure place of St. *Aug.* is alledge

Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 21. c. 24. *Sicut fallâ resurrectione non deerunt quibus post pœnas, quas patiuntur spiritus mortuorum impertiatur misericordia, ut in ignem non mittantur æternum; Neque enim de quibusdam veraciter diceretur—*

Even as at the resurrection there will not be wanting some, to whom, after the pains which the souls of the departed do suffer, mercy may be imparted, so that they shall not be cast into eternal fire. For it would not else be truly said of some: it shall not be forgiven, neither in this nor the world to come. What these *pains* are, and when suffered, he speaks not; and in the application of this Scripture he goes alone. Only he is plain for the Time of this *forgiveness* or *imparting of mercy*, that it is at the resurrection. But this will not stand with the Purgatory forgiveness nor with the profit to be raised out of Papal Indulgences, by which Souls may be loosed out of Pains every day, and sent to heavenly bliss before the resurrection.

Secondly, in regard of the Opposition between *Forgiveness* and punishment. The former Inference, which from our Saviours Negative *shall not be forgiven*, concluded, some *sins shall be forgiven then*, the *Cardinal* acknowledged not to follow according *to the Rules of Logick*; but from their supposed

ed forgiveneſs, to infer puniſhment, ſtill more unreaſonable. The Scripture ſ, *reconciliation* with God againſt pay- the *utmoſt farthing*, *Mat.* 5. 25. ſets *forgiving of the debt*, againſt *the pay- of the debt*, *Mat.* 18. 32. 34. The *Greeks* after the Council of *Florence* ſet their Apologie concerning Purgatory, reference to what they had diſcourſed with the *Latines* there: where we finde is to be one point of difference between them: * *What agreement*, ſay they, *is there between Remiſſion and ſuch purga- or puniſhment? there is no need of*, and a little after they ſhew that *S. Aug.* was the firſt that conceited this middle kinde of puniſhment after this life in order to forgiveneſs of ſome ſins; and the occaſion that brought him into that conceit they alſo declare, which we ſhall mention under the next Head.

* Τί γὰρ κοινὸν ἀφέσεως καὶ καθάρσεως διὰ πυρὸς καὶ κολάσεως —

IX. Of Pains after Death. The Text of 1 Cor. 3. 13. miſapplied to the Purgatory Fire.

Our fourth General Head, was concerning the Pains (and puniſhment) between Death and the Reſurrection. We have already conſidered them in relation to Forgiveneſs of ſin: now more ſpecially of the *Purgatory puniſhment*, which the Romaniſts apply what they meet with touching the purgation of *fire*. We will firſt examine that noted place of Scripture ſo often miſapplied by them

to

to their purgatory Fire. It is 1 Cor. 3. 13. *the fire shall try every mans work* and verſ. 15. *He ſhall be ſaved yet ſo as by fire.*

Bel. de purg. l. 1. c. 5. *Unum ex difficillimis locum—*

The *Cardinal* acknowledges this to be *one of the moſt difficult places*, and that ſo St. *Aug.* thought of it; and conſequently he ſhould have acknowledged it no fit place to ground an Article of Faith on: as affording no more certainty of a purging fire after death, then ſuch as St. *Aug.* does uſually expreſs in the ſeveral places, where he fals upon this Text, *ſuch a thing is not incredible*; *It may be, it is ſo*: and if any will take it ſo, *I do not reprove him.*

—non in credibile:
—forſitan ita eſt.
—non redarguo.

Again, the *Cardinal* giving us the ſeveral opinions of the Ancients about the meaning of *Hay and Stubble* there mentioned, he cannot finde any before St. *Gregory* that underſtood thereby *Venial ſins*, and therefore all the Ancients were far from conceiving any ſuch purgatory couched in this place. Alſo in giving us the ſeveral opinions of the Ancients touching *this Fire*: * He tels us *all the Ancients ſeem by the day* (mentioned ver. 13.) *to underſtand the day of the laſt judgement*: and he gives four Reaſons to prove it ſo: and after their different opinions of *the fire* (there alſo men-

Bel. ibid. Sect. Tertio quia—

entioned) he concludes, that cannot be *purgatory fire*, becauſe the *fire* in *Paul, touches all*, even thoſe *that build gold and ſilver*— *But the Purgatory fire does not prove their works. It remains therefore that we ſay, the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the fire of the ſevere and juſt judgment of God, which is not a purging and afflicting fire, but a proving and a trying fire*: and for this he gives unanſwerable reaſons, and in aſſerting this the *Cardinal* is found and ingenuous. But what will become then of his *Purgatory fire?* and wherefore is this Text urged for it? He finds it in the 15. verſ. *ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire*; This in the *Cardinals* imagination is the *purging fire*: But what conſent of Fathers for this interpretation? He acknowledges that ſome of the Ancients do there alſo underſtand the fire of *Tribulation*, ſome the fire of *Conflagration*, ſome the *eternal fire*: as St. *Chryſoſt.* and *Theophylact*, taking the word, (* *ſaved*) catachreſtically, for an eternal abiding or living in the fire: All theſe therefore are not for the *Romiſh purgatory fire*: As for thoſe Fathers he cites, they have another meaning; *Cyprians* words, *Long purged*

Bel. ibid. *omnes tangit— at Ignis purgatorius non probat opera eorum.*

— Apoſtolum loqui de igne ſeveri & juſti judicii Dei qui non eſt ignis purgans & affligens, ſed probans & examinans.

* σωθήσεται.

—*purgati diu igne.*

—*cui jam emendato* (not *emendatorio*) *igne opus non sit.*

purged with fire, were above cleared to be ſpoken in relation to the ſeverity of Eccleſiaſtical cenſures and penances: in this *Sect.* nu. 3. That which he has out of St. *Ambroſe* ſpeaks no more then, (what the *Cardinal* before had cited him for) the fire of the ſevere judgment of God. That which he brings out of St. *Aug.* upon Pſ. 37. *To whom there is no need of the amending fire:* is falſly cited; for it ſhould be thus, *To whom being amended, there is no need of fire*, that is, the fire of *tribulation* which God uſes in this life to that purpoſe, and of which St. *Auguſt.* often interprets the *fire* here mentioned in this place. Theſe are the three Fathers he alledges here for his interpretation of this Text, altogether impertinently; and theſe very Teſtimonies he cites again * in his chapt. of proofs out of Fathers for the Purgatory Fire or puniſhment. The like impertinency may be obſerved in all his other witneſſes alledged there, and miſapplied by him.

* Bel. de Purg. l. 1. c. 10.

X. Teſtimonies of Fathers miſapplied, as as to the Purgatory Fire.

That which is cited out of St. *Ambroſe* upon Pſ. 36. is plainly ſpoken of the laſt day. That which the ſame Father hath upon Pſal. 1. verſ. 5. of a fire, which they muſt endure between the firſt and ſecond reſurrection, *that loved darkneſs more than light*, I know not well what to make of, ſure

--*Tenebras magis quàm Lucem.*

re I am, it cannot fit their Purgatory re: For they that love darkneſs more n light, are of the worſt ſort; and thoſe Church of *Rome* does not ſend to the rgatory, but Hell fire. In *Hilar.* upon 119. *Gimel*, the *Cardinal* meets with ention of an *unwearied* or *not ceaſing* n: and miſapplies it to his conceit of rgatory: but is plainly meant of the re at the laſt day. *Hierom* alſo upon the words of *Iſa. their fire is not quenched:* lledged by the *Cardinal*, but the Father reſſly ſpeaks there of *wicked Chriſti-*, for whom the unquenchable fire of ell is prepared, and to that fire, that ice of the Prophet is applied in the oſpels. *Baſil* upon *Iſa.* 9. 18. is cited; which may be added what the ſame Fa-er ſaith upon *Iſa.* 4.4. In both places he nothing appliable to the *Romiſh Pur-ory fire*: but ſpeaks of the *Purgation examination by the fire of the day of dgment*: and ſhews in *cap.* 9. 18. how ur ſins are like graſs for the ſpreading in-reaſe thereof, but by repentance and con-eſſion are dried and withered, and made ke *Hay* and *Stubble* fit for burning up, which alludes to 1 *Cor.* 3.) Then ſhall n ſo dried and withered *be conſumed by e purging fire: viz.* by the fire of the ivine judgment before mentioned. The

Ignis indefeſſus.

ἢ ἐν τῷ πυρὶ εἰ ἡ κρίσις ὡς βάσανος.

— ὑπὸ τοῦ καθαρτικοῦ πυρὸς καταβρωθῆναι.

Greeks in the Council of *Florence* do we interpret that devouring or consumin of the *hay* and *ſtubble* by being made t
Ἀφανίζ. *vaniſh* or diſappear, as things burnt up do And ſo ſhall ſuch ſins or errors (as ar there compared to *hay* and *ſtubble*) a ter they have paſſed the examination o divine Judgment be done away and ap pear no more. St. *Baſil* alſo upon th 19. verſe of that chapter, ſpeaks of a *pu niſhing and afflicting fire*: but what fir is that? the fire, ſaith he, that *the Lor ſent into the earth*, *Luc.* 12. 49. and tha
— πῦ πνεῦ πῦ κολασ τικῷ — ὁπὶ ἐνεργασίᾳ τ ψυχῆς. is the fire of tribulation in this life: *Un to this puniſhing fire are our Terren* (ſin ful, carnal) *affections delivered up*; *for th benefit and amendment of the Soul.*

Gregory Nyſſen (*in orat. pro mortuis*) ſpeaks of the *Furnace of a purging fire* and is cited by the *Cardinal* for the *Ro miſh purgatory*, but plainly means the fir at the laſt day, which (as the Fathe thought) ſhould at length purge and re ſtore all men. And thoſe other word (which the *Cardinal* cites out of the ſam Orat.) *Of it he cannot be made partake unleſs firſt purged*, do plainly ſpeak o one, that dyed impure and in his ſins, ye may (as that Father thought) receive purgation after, when the Soul (parte from the body) ſees a difference betwee vertu

— *Non poteſt niſi purgatus fieri particeps.*

vertue and vice, and so turns to God: This speaks, what we noted * above of this Father, that he was tainted with the stain of that merciful opinion: derived down from *Origen*. * No. 7.

Nazianzen also (in *Sancta Lumina*) is cited by the *Cardinal*, but intends the fire of the Damned, for it concerns the *Novatians*, that denied the *baptism of Tears*, (or the reception of Penitents) and therefore were in danger, if they go on, to be *baptized with fire*: So that Father threatens them there: and let the *Romanists* judge whether obstinate Hereticks, such as they were supposed to be, are in danger of, and to be threatned with, the *Purgatory* or the *eternal* fire.

XI. They knew not such a Fire.

And now our Argument for the *Negative*, that the Fathers did not know the *Romish purgatory fire* (which begins at Death and goes out before the Resurrection, which afflicts and torments justified Souls) is evident by their speaking of several sorts of fire, that of *tribulation* in this life, that of the *severe judgment* of God at the last day, that of *Conflagration* at the end of the world, that of *eternal pain* after, and by their attributing a purgation to every of these; yet none of them mentioning the *Romish Purgatory*. Besides places newly cited out of the Fa-

thers, I finde *Nazianzen*, thus ſpeaking of *fire*, in his 26. Orat. *for Moderation in diſputing*: *The laſt fire, by which all our doings muſt be judged, and purged*: which is the fire of Gods judgment at the laſt day. And in his 40. Orat. *in Baptiſm.* he thus diſtinguiſhes the ſeveral ſorts of *Fire*. *I know* (ſaith he) *the purging fire, viz.* that which Chriſt *came to ſend on earth, Luc.* 12. 49. the fire of tribulation in this life: *I know*, ſaith he, *another fire*, but it is *a puniſhing, not a purging fire, viz.* the fire of the damned. Had he known another ſort of fire, that was both *purging* and *puniſhing* after death, as the Romiſh Purgatory fire is conceived to be, he would have mentioned it: In his *Orat. de Paſch.* he ſaith, there is *no purging* after this life: and in his *Orat. de plaga Grandinis*, after this life is a time of *puniſhing, not purging*. The *Romaniſts* are ready to reſtrain ſuch ſayings of the Fathers, to ſuch perſons as were not at all *purged* here, or did not in this life begin to purge themſelves; but his ſaying is general to all unto whom puniſhment or chaſtiſement is due; and had he known the *Romiſh Purgatory* after death, he would not have let thoſe former ſayings ſlip from him, without ſome mention of it. *Nicetas* alſo that comments upon him would have

Τὸ τελευταῖον πῦρ, ᾧ πάντα κεκίνηται, ἢ κριθήσεται τὰ ἤδη πραχθέντα.

πολλάκις καιρὸς ἐστὶ κολάσεως.

have taken occaſion to have ſpoken of it.

It was noted * above that St. *Chryſoſt.* upon that of Mat. 12. *not forgiven in this*— expounds *not forgiven*, by *ſhall be puniſhed* here and hereafter. In the ſame place, he takes occaſion to ſpeak of *puniſhment* in this life, and in the next: Some, ſaith he, are puniſhed *here and hereafter*, as the *Sodomites:* Some *not here*, but *hereafter*, as the *Rich glutton*, *Luc.* 16. Some *here*, *not hereafter*, as the inceſtuous *Corinthian:* Some *neither here nor hereafter*, as the *Apoſtles* and ſuch Diſciples of Chriſt. He did not know any other ſort or rank of men puniſhed, ſuch as they are that go to be tormented in Purgatory; And leſt it ſhould be objected, that the Apoſtles and ſuch Diſciples of Chriſt ſuffered great perſecution and affliction, and therefore were ſore puniſhed in this life: He ſevers the notion of *Puniſhment* from their *afflictions* or Trials. For ſpeaking of the ſufferings of *Job*, and ſuch men, he tels us, they were not the *ſufferings of puniſhment*, or inflicted on ſuch men as puniſhments, but belonged to *the combate*, and were for their *exerciſe*. So may there be other ends of Gods ſending Afflictives (after ſin forgiven) then for puniſhment: but of that Torment in Pur-

* Nu. 8.

— ὃ δ' οὐ τιμωρίας — ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀγώνων, καὶ παιδαγωγιῶν.

gatory, no end or reason can be given, besides punishment. We will conclude with St. *Aug.* the only Father that (for the first 400 years) spoke any thing to the purpose of that Purgatory punishment between Death & the Resurrection.

XII. *St. Augustines* opinion touching Purgatory pains.

It is very evident how he came first to stumble upon that conceit; if we consider the prevalency and danger of that merciful opinion touching the pains of the damned, which this Father observed and endeavoured to work out of mens minds. This opinion touching the end or mitigation of those pains, we noted * above. The danger of it the *Greeks* in their forementioned Apology, do well note: saying, *It was thought in the 5. Synod, to be a most cruel opinion, pernicious to the Church, and loosing the nerves and endeavours of the vertuously disposed.* St. *Aug.* saw this, and therefore often encounters it, especially in his book of the *City of God:* but in his contending against it, stumbled, as I said, upon this conceit; seeming out of his earnest desire of working that dangerous merciful opinion out of the minds of Christians, to be content there should be Temporary pains conceived to remain for some sort of men between their death and

* Nu. 7.

Ἀπανθρωποτάτη δόξα- λυμαντικὴ τῆς Ἐκκλη σίας, καὶ τῆς σπουδαίων ἐκλυτικὴ.

and Resurrection. And this also the *Greeks*, in the aforesaid Apology, do observe in that Father: saying of the *Latines* in General, *that to take away a greater evil* (the ceasing of the pains of Hell fire) *they yielded to a less:* (a kinde of purging fire) before the resurrection; and of St. *August.* they say, *that he willing & endeavouring to work that opinion out of mens minds, admitted this third sort of punishment.* This is evident to him that will examine the several passages of St. *August.* one and twentieth Book of the *City of God*: as where he seems to be content, that men should think favourably of some mitigation in the pains of the damned, so they would hold them eternal; for of that opinion of mitigation, he saith; *I do not therefore confirm it, because I do not resist it*; he had * before suggested what he thought more probable, *viz. Some Temporal pains before the last day.*

—τὸ μεῖζόν τι κακὸν ἀναιρῶν συγχωρῆσαι τὸ ἔλαττον. τοῦτο ἐν βέλομένῳ ἀνελεῖν — τῇ μέσῃ ταύτῃ συγχωρεῖ κολάσει.

Aug. l 21. de Civ. Dei c. 24. —non ideo confirmo, quia non resisto.

* Aug. l. 21. c. 16.

There is a place which the *Romanists* much urge in behalf of *Purgatory*; what sense it bears is not very certain; but certainly it cannot be applied to Purgatory. Speaking to those words, *in the sweat of thy browes, Gen.* 3. 19. he saith, *He that tills his field*, (*i. e.* orders

his life carefully and vertuously) *it is not needful that he should suffer after this life: but he that tils it not but suffers it to be overgrown with thorns, he has in this life a Curse, and after this life, he shall have either the fire of purgation, or the eternal punishment.* That he alludes here to *Heb.* 6, 7. is very apparent: that such as are sent to *Purgatory* cannot be intended here, is also apparent; for these are careless and profane Christians, whose lives are overgrown with vice, and are supposed to so continue till death, and are therefore *subject to cursing*, and must be *burnt* with the eternal fire. And it is probable, he puts in that *fire of purgation*, by way of concession only to the merciful opinion: as if he had said, *He that suffers his life to be so overgrown* — must have his *burning*, either such as that opinion fancied, such at least; or else eternal pains, which indeed is the Truth.

Aug. de Genesi. contrà Manich. l. 2. c. 20. *Qui coluerit agrum suum, post hanc vitam non est necesse ut patiatur; Qui non coluerit, sed Spinis eum opprimi permiserit, habet in hac vita maledictionem, & post hanc vitam habebit vel ignem purgationis, vel pœnam æternam.*

Now concerning these supposed pains or purging fire after death, St. *Aug.* uses many expressions of uncertainty, far from any stedfastness of belief. As when he

Aug de fide & operibus, c. 16. De Civit. Dei, l. 21. c. 26. Enchirid. c. 69. Ad Dulcitium qu. 1.

he ſaith, *If in that interval*, or ſpace between death and reſurrection, any will conceive ſuch a fire, ſuch pains, *It may be true, and I do not reprove or contend againſt it*; Again, *Some ſuch thing may be after this life*— and, *whether it be ſo, may be queſtioned*, or inquired into: *It is not incredible*, that it ſhould be ſo. Again, *that ſome ſuch judgments or puniſhments follow after this life, it does not in my opinion abhor from the reaſon of Truth.* All theſe the *Cardinal* recites by way of objection in his firſt Book *de Purgat. c.* 15. But what anſwer gives he? This, That St. *Aug.* *did only doubt of the kinde or ſort of ſin, that was to be puniſhed*— which is altogether impertinent, as may at firſt ſight appear to him, that looks into the places cited: Therefore elſewhere he gives theſe Anſwers; That St. *Aug.* *doubted only of the quality of the pain or torment, whether it were the ſame fire in ſubſtance with that of Hell*: alſo, that *he doubted, whether ſouls ſhall be ſcorched with that fire of grief, for the loſs of things temporal*— But theſe exceptions or anſwers

Si hoc temporis intervallo— forſitan verum eſt— non redarguo.

Tale aliquid etiam poſt hanc vitam fieri poteſt— & utrum ita ſit quæri poteſt.

Non eſt incredibile.

Talia quædam judicia poſt hanc vitam— non abhorret, quantum arbitror, a ratione veritatis.

—dubitare ſolùm de genere peccati, quod punitur.

Bel. l. *Dubitat de pœnæ qualitate, an idem ſit ignis—*

—an anima urentur igne illo doloris de amiſſione temporalium—

are also impertinent: for his *Tale aliquid*, some such thing, and his *Talia quædam judicia*, some such punishments do not refer to any material fire, or fire properly taken, or to such a fire as Hell fire: but to the *fire of tribulation* in this life, which he every where speaks of, when he fals upon that place of 1 *Cor.* 3. 13. and that *some such thing*, that is afflictive, may be after this life, he thinks *not incredible*; and *that perhaps it is so*. For let the *Romanists* conceive the pain or Torment of purgatory to be of what condition or sort soever they please, it will be answered by that *tale aliquid*, and *talia quædam judicia*; and so will imply that Fathers uncertainty in that his opinion of Purgatory pains after death; So for *that fire of grief upon loss of Temporals*, which the *Cardinal* will have St. *Aug.* doubt of: it is plain he could not mean that very kinde of grief when he said *tale aliquid*, *some such thing*, but any kinde of grief or vexation that should torment the soul as with a kinde of fire. Whether there were *any such thing*, any such grief or pain, that's it he put to the question, and declared his opinion of it, that it *was not incredible*, but rather that he held it probable: and that place in his Book *de Civit. Dei*, where he delivered it positively,

sitively, that there were such purging pains, can amount to no more then an opinion he had entertained; which he delivers there the more peremptorily, in opposition to that other opinion of the Ceasing of the pains of the damned.

To conclude, the *Cardinal* declares it as a thing Certain, *that there is in Purgatory the punishment of fire, whether taken properly or Metaphorically*: whether a *real fire*, such as of Hell, or such a pain, that as fire, torments the souls of men: Now St. *Angust.* his *tale aliquid*— of which he doubted, was such a thing, such a fire or tormenting pain; and therefore St. *Aug.* was *uncertain* of that, which the Church of *Rome* delivers as *certain*, and as an Article of Faith.

Bel. de purg. l. 2. c. 10. *Certum, esse in Purgatorio pœnam ignis, sive propriè accipiatur sive Metaphoricè.*

SECT.

SECT. VII.

Of the Real Presence.

I. The question.

TOuching the state of this Controversie, there was enough said above, Chap. VII. Nu. 1. That we deny not a *Real presence*, but such a *presence* as they contend for, such as by a transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine, fixes the body and bloud of Christ under the remaining species: the inconveniencies of which are hinted above chap. VII. Nu. 13, 16, 17. I will only add, to the farther clearing of this state of the Question, what the *Cardinal* notes upon the word *substantialiter* in the *Trent* Council, can. 1. sess. 13. It means, *that Christ is in the Eucharist after the same manner, that the substance of bread was under its accidents: this only excepted, that those accidents were inherent in the substance of the Bread.* So then, such a manner of Presence is that which we deny.

* Bel. l. 1. de Euchar. c. 2. *Christum esse in Eucharistia ad eum modum, quo erat substantia panis sub suis accidentibus.*—

The Scripture which they pretend, (*This is my body*) was examined * above, and found

* Chap. 7.

found to be best explained by that of the Apostle. * *The bread which we break, is the communion or communication of the body of Christ*: which supposes the bread continuing in substance, and tels us how it is (notwithstanding) the body of Christ. * 1 Cor. 10. 16.

H. Testimonies of Antiquity.

And now for a brief Survey of Antiquity, upon this enquiry: whether such a presence by way of Transubstantiation or fixing the body of Christ under the species, in stead of the substance of the bread, was taught as Catholick Doctrine. The Truth will quickly appear by the different condition and force of those Testimonies which they and we bring from Antiquity, within the compass of 600. years. Many sayings of the Fathers they alledge, and want not for number but weight. For if those sayings or sentences be examined, they will be found not to speak properly and strictly to the point, but either fall short of the *change* here intended, or shoot beyond all measure, by some hyperbolical expressions: whereas we bring Testimonies of Fathers speaking punctually of the *nature* and *substance* of the Elements according to the proper and strict sense of those words: Also we bring real Arguments, necessarily concluding (by that which the Fathers disputed

disputed against Hereticks) that *Transubstantiation*, or such a Presence, by putting the body of Christ in the place of the substance of Bread, could not be the Doctrine of the Church. We will reduce all to this Head: *The remaining of the substance of Bread and Wine.*

III. Sayings of Fathers alledged by the *Romanists*.

First, To omit all those bare sentences, which affirm it to be *the body or flesh of Christ*, after Consecration; as speaking nothing but what we say, and what we conceive ought to be answered in the affirmative, if the question be put, *Whether is this the body of Christ*: And it speaks no more then the Apostle 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *This bread is the communication of the body of Christ*: And it is to be noted that some of the sentences alledged by the *Romanists*, expresly make *Bread* the subject of that affirmative proposition, saying, *Panem esse corpus Christi, that bread is the body of Christ*, or the like: which kinde of speech the *Romanists*, themselves acknowledge *improper* and *figurative*. Also to omit all those sentences, which barely say, *the bread is changed*: or *transelemented*, or the like. For there are many kindes of *change*, and that only, which is concerned in the Question, is the change of substance.

Secondly therefore, Those Testimonies only,

only may seem to speak something to the purpose, which say the Elements are *changed in Nature*: for this *Cyprian*, *Ambrose* and *Nyssen* are alledged by the *Cardinal*. But the word *Nature* is of a large acception here: not expressing the *substance* or essence of the thing, but the condition and special quality of it, as we say; Things are of different *Nature*, some are common and profane, some holy and divine: so the elements after consecration are changed in *their Nature*, beginning then to be of holy use and divine vertue. On the contrary, we alledge *Theodoret* denying they are changed in *Nature*, taking the word strictly for the substantial nature, as the dispute he there makes required he should do: * *changing*, saith he, *not the Nature* (of the Symbols or Elements) *but adding grace unto nature*, by which grace or blessing of consecration they become of holy use and divine vertue. Again he saith, The Symbols *do not go out of their proper nature*. And this he spoke in answer to the *Eutychian*, objecting the change made in the Sacrament as a proof or illustration of the change of the Humane Nature into the Divine, asserted by those Hereticks. In the place which the *Cardinal* alledged out of St. *Cyprian*,

* Bel. de Euch. l. 3. c. 20.

* Theod. Dialog. 1. c. 8. ἡ μὲν φύσις μετακαλῶν ἀλλὰ τῷ χάριν τῇ φύσει προσδιδοικώς.

Theod. Dial. 2. οὐκ ἐξίσταται τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως.

in

in his Sermon *de Cœna*: is subjoyned the similitude of the Humanity and Divinity of Christ, united together: which very frequently is by the Fathers applied to the business of the Sacrament. The *Cardinal* opposes, that St. *Cyprian* saith there, *The bread by the omnipotence of the Word is made his flesh:* Now what omnipotency is it, saith he, to make the Bread only signifie his body? The Omnipotency, say we, is not in making the Bread a bare sign of his body, as he would impose upon us, nor yet in changing it substantially into the body of Christ, as he would have us believe; but in making the bread his body (or communication of his body) and yet to remain what it was, the same in substance: as St. *Ambrose* expresses it, *That they be what they were, and yet turned into another thing*, viz. into the body and bloud of Christ; and this he affirms to be a greater work then that of Creation, which made *things to be, which were not.* There is one place which the *Cardinal* cites out of St. *Chrysostome de Euchar. in Encæniis.* I could not finde it, but thus it speaks as he reports it, *Do'st thou see Bread? or Wine? do they go as other meats into the draught? far be that from them! do not think so.* Then followes, *for as Wax, if*

Omnipotentiâ Verbi caro factus.

Ambr. de Sacram, l. 4. c. 4. Ut sint, quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur.

Num vides panem? num vinum? num sicut reliqui cibi in secessum vadunt? absit! ne Cogites.

is be held to the fire, is assimulated to the fire (or turned into a flame) *and nothing of the substance remains. So also think here, the Mysteries are consumed by the substance of the body.* Answ. It is familiar with that father, for better raising the thoughts from all earthly considerations in this Sacrament, to use such manner of speeches: Elsewhere he bids them, not to think *they are now on Earth, but in Heaven*, and that they *receive it from the hand of a Cherubim or Seraphim:* So here, *Do not think thou seest Bread and Wine*, &c. and so think here *the Mysteries are consumed*, as Wax turned into a flame; to shew there is nothing of terrene or bodily consideration, nothing for filling the belly, intended or left in the use and purpose of this Sacrament: and so neither should there be any thing of that concernment in our thoughts. Now as to the point, which the *Romanists* aim at, the *not remaining of the substance of Bread and Wine:* We may say in strict reasoning it would follow also, that the *Species* of Bread and Wine do not remain, for he saith, *the Mysteries are consumed*, and those according to the Romish doctrine, are the *Species* after consecration. But in all Reason we ought to have more regard to Fathers speaking punctually

Sic & hic puta, Mysteria consumi Corporis substantia.

punctually and properly in their Commentaries, or disputes, then loosly and and at large in their Rhetorical flourishes and perswasions, as St. *Chrysost.* often doth, and most especially on this matter of the Sacrament. We shall therefore now add some Testimonies of the Fathers speaking distinctly and properly to the point.

IV. Testimonies for remaining of the substance of the Elements.

First of those that had to do with Hereticks, and were in their disputes bound to speak properly and to the point.

Irenæus dealt against such as denied our Saviour to be the Son of the God of the Old Testament, or of the God that made and created all; against whom he brings one argument from the Sacrament instituted by our Saviour: saying, *Our sentence or doctrine is consonant to the Eucharist, and the Eucharist confirmeth our Doctrine:* Why? because Christ as the Son of God, took of his Creatures Bread and Wine, to apply them to his own use and purpose. So his making an *Eucharist* of those Creatures or fruits of the earth, made against the vanity of that Heretical assertion: In like manner the *Eucharist*, or that which *Irenæus* saith of it here, *confirms our Doctrine* against the *Romanists.*

Iren. l. 4. c. 34. *Nostra sententia est consonans Eucharistiæ, & Eucharistia confirmat nostram sententiam.*

nists. For there he saith. *The Bread* (after consecration) *is not now common bread, but an Eucharist, consisting of two things, the earthly and the Heavenly.* Panis non jam communis panis est, sed Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans, terrena & cœlesti. Iren. ibid.

not *common bread*, yet bread still: and if it *consists* of these two, then is *bread* still in it; for if it could not *consist* of it. And this according to the *Cardinals* own reading, who intending by this place to prove a *Real presence of Christs body and bloud* in the Sacrament, argueth thus. *Irenæus* saith, *It consists of the Earthly and the Heavenly part*, but nothing can consist, saith the *Cardinal*, of that which is not in it: not observing that it equally proves the substantial presence of the bread, for it *consists* of the terrene as of the cœlestial. Now we can say the cœlestial part, the substance of Christs body and bloud is given in the Sacrament; they dare not say it of the substance of the terrene part; but betake them to the *species* of bread and wine: when as *Irenæus* speaks of the substantial creatures and fruits of the earth, and it concerned them to mean so; else those Hereticks might have said our Saviour took those creatures to destroy them, and leaves only the appearance and species of those things, Bel. de Euch. l. 2. c. 6. *Nihil constare dicitur ex eo, quod in ipso non est.*

things, which the God of the Old T
stament had made.

Again, the *Cardinal* makes another a
gument from those words of *Irenæus*, O

—*jam non sunt corruptibilia, spem resurrectionis habentia.* Iren. ibid.

bodies receiving the Euch
rist, are not now corruptib
as having the hope of a resu
rection: wherein he abuses that good F
ther, and himself. For thus he argu
from that saying. *Our bod*

Corpora nostra reipsa fient immortalia, ergo panis terrenus reipsa fit corpus Christi. Bel. ibid.

shall be truly & indeed inco
ruptible, therefore the terre
bread is truly indeed made t
body of Christ. Whereas that Father spea
of the present, *Our bodies are not no*
corruptible, which the *Cardinal* turns i
to, *shall be incorruptible*: because h
could not say, *they are now truly a*
indeed incorruptible. So that accordin
to this Father the Argument would stan
thus: *As our bodies now are incorrupt*
ble, (not because they are so according t
nature and substance, but) in as much a
they *have the hope of a resurrection*; t
the Bread is the body of Christ, (not be
cause changed in nature and substanc
but) in as much as by the grace of conse
cration it is the communion of his body.

Tertullian had to do with *Marcio*
and such Hereticks that denied Christ ha
a true and solid body. And he proves th
contrar

trary by *Bread the figure of his body*, Tertul. contra Mar. cion. lib. 4. c. 40. *Non fuiſſet figura, niſi veritatis eſſet corpus.*
th in the Old Teſtament and in the
hariſt. *Now*, ſaith he, *it could not be*
figure of his body, if his body were not
ue body; And if there be force in this
ſon, then ſhould *Marcion* (ſuppoſing
nſubſtantiation) have great advan-
upon a phantaſtical figure, that had
ſubſtance of bread, but only the Acci-
ts and appearances: and upon ſuch a
ntaſtical mode of a Body, as the *Ro-*
doctrine puts our Saviours body in-
Alſo the words following: *If he*
bread (as thoſe Hereticks ſaid) *to*
ke it his body, becauſe he wanted a true
y: then it would follow, that Bread was
en and crucified for us: Theſe words
ſay) do neceſſarily ſuppoſe the ſub-
nce of Bread to remain: for how could
t be ſaid, if the Bread alſo ſhould want
truth of a body; remaining only in
ew and appearance? which would
ch have confirmed *Marcion* in his
isbelief of the reality of Chriſts body, of
hich there ſhould be ſo phantaſtical a
gure or ſign. This is ſo evident and con-
ncing, that *Beatus Rhenanus* in his An-
otations, acknowledges *Tertullian* of
his judgment, *That Bread is ſo the figure*
Chriſts body, that it ſtill remains the ſame
ſubſtance as it was before.

Si propterea panem ſibi corpus finxit, quia corporis carebat veritate— Tert. ibid.

Add

Add to this what he ſa
elſewhere: *The ſenſes*
not deceived in their own
jects, leſt thereby ſometh
of advantage might be g
ded to the Hereticks, mak
but a phantaſm of Chri
The taſt of the diſciples was not
ceived, when in the marriage of Cana t
drank wine made of Water, nor was t
Feeling of Thomas abuſed, when he
his finger in our Saviours ſide. N
are our ſenſes (may we ſay) abuſed
deceived, when they tell us, this is tr
bread, which is in the Sacrament.

Tertul. de anima c. 17. *Senſus non falli circa objecta, ne hinc aliquid procuretur Hæreticis, de Chriſto phantaſma credentibus. Non eſt guſtus Diſcipulorum iudificatus—*

Theodoret had to do with the *Eu*
chian Hereticks, that held our Saviou
humanity ſwallowed up in the Divi
Nature: for which they made Argume
from the Sacrament; *That even as t*
Symbols or Elements were after conſecra
tion changed into another thing (for ſuc
was the common phraſe of that Tim
when ſpeech was of the Sacrament)
is the humane Nature or body of the Lor
after aſſumption changed into the divi
ſubſtance. This Argument had been u
anſwerable had Tranſubſtantiation bee
then the Doctrine of the Church; B
Theodoret anſwers him that makes th
Argument; *Thou art taken in thy ow*

Theod. Dial. 2.

Net

Not: for the Symbols do not go out of their proper nature, but remain in ther former Substance, and figure and shape.

—οὐκ ἐξίστανται τῆς οἰκείας φύσεως, μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἴδους.

That the words, *Nature*, and *Substance* must be here taken properly, and not confounded (as in the *Romanists* irrational answer they are) with the *Accidents* or Species of the Bread and Wine, is clearly evinced both by the absurdity of putting *Substance* for *Accidents*, and by the very reason of the Argument here made, which supposeth *Nature* and *Substance* properly taken on the *Eutychian* part, and so must be meant in *Theodorets* Reply, to the plain exclusion of a *Substantial change*.

The like demonstration is made by *Gelasius* in his * Book of the two Natures of Christ, against *Eutyches* & *Nestorius*. Of which Book the † *Cardinal* acknowledgeth, *that* Gelasius *taught the same with* Theodoret, *and for confirming of the very same thing.* It being familiar with the Catholick writers of those Times, to use the instance of the Eucharist against the *Eutychian* Heresie; which did necessarily infer the remaining of the substance of the Elements, to shew the remaining of

* In Biblioth. Patrum, To. 5. parte. 3.

† Bel. de Euch, l. 2. c. 27. *Idem proxime docet, quod Theodoretus, & ad eandem rem confirmandam.*

of the humane Nature of Christ after its assumption. Nay before that Heresie appeared, some of the Ancients did make use of the same Instance, arguing from the Union of the two Natures in Christ, to shew the Sacramental Union, as they that wrote against *Eutyches* did from the Sacrament borrow a demonstration or illustration for the two Natures united in our Saviour Christ. *Justin Martyr* saith thus, *We take these not as common bread, or common drink, but even as Jesus Christ being made Flesh by the Word of God, had flesh and bloud for our salvation: So we learn also, that the meat or food, (which by the prayer of his Word is blessed and made an Eucharist, & by which our flesh and bloud through the change of it, are nourished) is the flesh and bloud of the same incarned Jesus.* Here is Bread, though not *common bread* after consecration; and Bread remaining in *Substance*, for it nourishes our bodies by a change into our flesh, and it must answer to our Saviours flesh remaining in substance after the Incarnation: notwithstanding that it is made the body of Christ, so far as the reason and

Just. Apol. 2. ad Anton. —οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡμετέρας σωτηρίας ἔσχεν, οὕτω καὶ τὴν διὰ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν —

and purpose of the Eucharist requires.

St. *Cyprian* or the Author of that Sermon *de Cœna*: of the Lords Supper saith, *Even as in the Person of Christ, the humanity appeared, and the Divinity laid hid; So doth the divine essence ineffably insinuate itself into the visible sacred Element.* This place is cited for a Real Presence, by the *Cardinal*: but he should have considered, it cannot be such a Real Presence as will serve his turn. For the substantial presence of the visible outward element is equally proved by this saying of the Father; and a dangerous thing it is to make the bread and wine remain, as the *Cardinal* doth, in shew and appearance only; which renders this instance of the Sacrament held altogether useless against those Hereticks, which held our Saviours body or humanity was but such in appearance only, not substance.

Sicut in persona Christi Humanitas apparebat, latebat Divinitas; ità sacro visibili divina se ineffabiliter infundit essentia.

Thus the Fathers that dealt with Hereticks were bound to speak properly and distinctly; and did so, as we have seen. We will add to these, First, *Origen* speaking by way of distinction, and therefore exactly to the point. *That food*, saith he, *which is sanctified by the Word*

Orig. in Mat. 15. 17. *Ille cibus qui sanctificatur per—— juxtà id, quod habet Materiale, in Secessum mittitur.*

of God and Prayer, according to the Material part of it, (there's his distinction) *goes into the belly and is sent into the draught.* The *Cardinal* is here driven to their poor shift, of interpreting the *Material* part of that food, by the *Visible Accidents* of it.

Secondly, St. *Ambrose* his saying is remarkable, speaking of the Elements: *That they be what they were, and yet be changed into another thing:* that is, made the Body and Blood of the Lord. The *Cardinal* makes two impertinent answers: First, that some read it, (*Ut quæ erant, in aliud commutentur*) *that the things which were, be turned into another thing*; and this he approves as consonant to that, which St. *Ambrose* speaks in his Book *de Initiandis: That Word, which could make of nothing that which was not* (so in the Creation) *can it not change those things that were, into that which they were not?* So in the Sacrament. But the purpose of the Father in this place is different, from what it was in the former: here he shews the *possibility* of this change in the Sacrament, by that of the Creation:

Ambr. de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4. *Ut sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur.*

Ambr. de Init. c. 9. *Sermo qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non potest ea quæ sunt mutare in id, quod non erant?*

Creation: arguing *a majori ad minus*, from the *greater* work to the *less*: it being a greater work to make a thing out of nothing, then out of that which was; and so in that respect it was fitting to say, *ea quæ sunt — those things that are, be changed into what they were not.* But in the former place it was his purpose to shew the *greatness* of this work or change in the Sacrament above that of the Creation: for which it was necessary to say (*ut sint quæ erant*) *that they be what they were*: for though it be a greater work to make a thing out of nothing, as Wine created, then to make it out of that which was before, as Wine out of water, *Joh.* 2. yet is it a greater work then that of Creation, to make or change things into another thing, and yet those things to remain what they were: as in the Sacrament. *How much more operative is that word* (saith he) *that they be what they were, and yet changed into another thing?* The *Cardinal* therefore in his second answer, retires to his old shift, saying that the outward *Accidents* remain what they were. But he might have remembred that *sint* and *erant* are Verbs Substantives, and when spoken of bodies (as here) simply and without the adjection of qualities or Accidents attributed to them, must

Quanto magis est operatorius — ut sint quæ erant —

mean the substantial being of such bodies. Or if the *Cardinal* had inquired, *what are changed into another thing*, he would have found, *those things that are, what they were*: but those things cannot be the outward *Accidents* of Bread and Wine, for they are not changed into that other thing: *i.e.* the Body and Bloud of Christ. Or lastly, had he considered the purpose of St. *Ambrose*, he might easily have observed it was necessary for him to say of the substances of Bread and Wine, *that they are what they were.*

I might add many Testimonies out of St. *Aug.* which upon the consideration of the nature of a Sacrament, and upon other Reasons and occasions, speak punctually to the same purpose; that the visible signs or outward Elements remain in their former substance, and yet are the body and bloud of Christ, so far as the reason and purpose of that Sacrament requires. But these which I have alledged may suffice.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

Of Communion in one kinde.

IN the ſtate of this Controverſie, we find two points aſſerted by the *Romaniſts* (as appears by what ſaid above, *Ch.* VIII.)

I. That it may be ſo adminiſtred to the People, when it may be done otherwiſe: or that the People may be forbidden to receive it otherwiſe.

II. That ſuch a receiving is a compleat Communion.

The Scriptures that concern this Controverſie were examined above. And for the Doctrine and Practiſe of the Catholick Church, we will only add ſome Generals, which will clear the point on the Proteſtants ſide.

I. The confeſſion of the *Romiſh* writers, granting the uſe of receiving in both kindes, continued from our Saviours time many ages throughout the Church. As may be ſeen in the Council of *Conſtance*, in *Alphonſ. de Caſtro*, *Soto*, *Coſterius*, *Tolet.*

II. In anſwering to the Teſtimonies of the Fathers (aſſerting Communion in both

Bel. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 26.

kindes) we finde the *Cardinal* (and so the rest of them) forced to acknowledge *the use and practise*, and content to say, Those Testimonies do not speak *a Necessity* it should be so.

Now that it should be so, where it can be so, *necessarily* follows upon our Saviours *precept*, *Drink ye all of this*, (the Disciples, that did all drink, representing then the whole company of the faithful, as the Fathers frequently assert) and upon the force of his *Institution*, and *Example*, and the answerable *practice* of the Catholick Church in the succeeding Ages; For if so, what Church or Age following shal think it self at liberty to do otherwise?

III. In proving those false Assertions, but necessary for the Romanists to hold, (*viz.* * *That the whole Reason of the Sacrament is contained in one kinde:* and *That there is not greater profit received by communion in both kindes, then in one:*) we finde the *Cardinal* cannot alledge One Father, nor rise higher then *Thomas Aquinas*.

* Bel. de Euchar. l. 4. c. 22. & 23.

IV. As they cannot bring one *Sentence* of any Ancient Father commending or allowing their *half Communion*: so the *Instances* they give us for it, are impertinent, and unconcluding: far from proving, the People may *be held from* receiving in both:

or

or made to believe they have a *compleat Communion* in One.

A Collection of such Instances we finde in the * *Cardinal*; The chief of them are these following. I. The *breaking of Bread*, often mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, and sometimes signifying the Sacrament. What then? They gave it to the people in one kinde only, because one only is mentioned. If this be a good argument as to the *administration*, it will be good also as to the *Consecration*: they consecrated it in one kinde only, because one only is mentioned. But if the *Romanists* count it Sacriledge (as indeed it is) so to consecrate: they might think it Sacriledge also, wilfully so to administer it. II. The custom of giving the *Bread dipped in the Wine* for a whole Sacrament. What then? therefore it is not necessary that both kinds should be given severally; But by this expedient we see they thought it necessary to *give both*; Also this was only used in some places, and it seems at first to be found out for Communicating Infants and sick persons, that could not well swallow it dry. And afterward this custom was rejected and forbidden. III. The carrying of *one kind* to the sick, *viz.* Bread only. But where both could, both were carried: it was necessity, if in one; and bet-

* Bel. in defens. Apolog. contra Regem Jacobum c. 13. & in l. 4. de Euch. c. 24.

Intincta.

Communio Ægrorum.

ter one then neither, and an *incompleat Communion*, then none at all. IV. The Communion of the *preconsecrated* Elements: when as one day in the Passion Week, they used to receive in one kinde. But this was not from the beginning: 2. Not held a *compleat Communion*: but a consuming of the remainder of the *preconsecrated Bread*: the Wine being all consumed or made an end of, the day before—3. From this usage to conclude a liberty of abstinence from the Wine in celebration of the Sacrament is unreasonable: 4. The Priest did that day receive but one kinde: therefore it might be likewise concluded: that it was (or may be) the practise of the Church, to have the Priest, as well as the people, confined to receive in one kinde. I will only add, what *Micrologus*, saith in his *Ecclesiast. Observations*, where the Title of his 19. chapt. is Of *avoiding Intinction*: or giving the *Host dipped*. *It is not Authentick*, saith he, *which some do*, giving it dipped, for *the completion of a Communion*: and that the Wine or other Species is to be given, (he means severed from the other) *that the people may fully and compleatly communicate*. Also he there tels us, that *Julius* the first, (Bishop of *Rome*) writing to certain *Ægyptian* Bishops, forbids that usage, and enjoyns

Communio Præsanctificatorum.

Microl. in Biblioth. Patrum c. 19. de vitanda inintinctione: Non est Authenticum, &c. —ut populus plenè communicare possit.

enjoyns, that *both kindes be received ſeverally* (*Seorsùm panem & ſeorsùm Calicem.*) And that *Gelaſius* (Biſhop of *Rome*) puts them under cenſure of Excommunication, *who abſtain from the Cup, having received the body of our Lord:* and in the ſame Decree, defines it *Sacriledge* to do ſo. This is alſo in *Gratian. Decr. part.* 3. *de Conſecratione.* And this enough to convince the boldneſs of the *Romiſh* Church, in doing contrary to all this, and yet aſſerting her Doctrine and Practiſe to be Catholick.

Deo Gloria.

THE END

Books written by Dr. Ferne.

CErtain Considerations of present concernment touching the reformed Church of *England*. in 12°.

A Compendious Discourse upon the Case as it stands betwixt the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome* on the one hand, and again betwixt the same Church of *England* and those Congregations that have divided from it on the other hand: in 12°.

His Sermon preach'd at the Isle of *Wight*: 4°.

Episcopacy and Presbytery considered: 4°.

The Refuter Refuted, or Dr. *Hammond* defended againſt the impertinent Cavils of Mr. *Henry Jeanes*, by *William Creed*, B. D. Rector of East-*Codford* in *Wiltshire*.

The Persecuted Minister, or a defence of the Ministry and the Church, by *I. Langley* Minister of the Gospel: in 4°.

The Law of Lawes, or the Excellency of the Civil Law, by Dr. *Robert Wiseman*, 4°. Or the History of Animals, as they are useful in Physick and Chyrurgery, by Dr. *Schroder*, 8°.

Enchiridion of Fortifications, or a handful of knowledge in Martial affairs, with 22. brass Cuts.

Devotions of the Ancient Church, in seven pious Prayers with seven Administrations: in 8. New.

The Calvinists Cabinet unlockt, by *Tilenus Junior*, 12. New.